DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 342 HE 012 259

AUTHOR Berry, Margaret C., Ed.
TITLE Women in Higher Education Administration: A Book of Readings.
INSTITUTION National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 193p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1625 I Street, NW, Suite 624-A, Washington, DC 20006

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Deans; Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Education; Administrator Evaluation; *Administrators; Affirmative Action; *College Administration; College Presidents; Elementary Education; *Females; Governance; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Leadership; Principals; *Promotion (Occupational); *Sex Discrimination

ABSTRACT

The status and satisfaction of women in higher education administration are addressed in 29 articles. Contents include the following: Why Don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education (Sylvia-Lee Tibbets); Training Women for Administration (Rae Andre and Mary I. Edwards); Kindergarten: The Training Ground for Women in Administration (Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard); Performance of Women Principals (Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker); Our Dwindling National Resource: Women School Administrators (Laurine E. Fitzgerald); Upward Job Mobility for Women in Elementary Education (Jane K. MacDonald); Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities (Edward J. Van Meir); Interest and Involvement of Women in University Governance (Julia K. Muller); Job Satisfaction of Women Administrators in Higher Education (Mary Elizabeth Reeves); Women College and University Presidents (Martha McGee); Women as Academic Administrators in the Age of Affirmative Action (Marian Lief Palley); How Do Women Administrators View Job Satisfaction and Discrimination (Judith Cochran); A Leap of Faith: Or How To Beat the Middle Management Syndrome (Barbara Baxter Pillinger); Roadblocks to Women's Careers in Educational Administration (Gregory C. Coffin and Ruth B. Ekstrom); and Women Presidents: The First Fifty Years (Josephine Johnson and Charles F. O'Brien). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191342

WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

A Book of Readings

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAWDAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Edited by
Margaret C. Berry

HE 012 257

The National Association for Women Deans,
Administrators and Counselors
1625 "I" Street, N. W., Suite 624-A
Washington, D.C. 20006

Additional copies are available from the
National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors
1625 "I" Street, N.W., Suite 624A, Washington, D.C. 20006

Copyright 1979 © by the National Association for Women Deans,
Administrators, and Counselors
Printed in the United States of America

Margaret C. Berry, a native Texan and an honor graduate of The University of Texas at Austin, earned the M.A. and the Ed.D. at Teachers College, Columbia University. She is currently director of the University Writings Collection at The University of Texas at Austin. She previously served as associate dean of students and then director of developmental programs in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs at U.T. Austin. Earlier, she was dean of women at East Texas State University. Her experience also includes administrative responsibilities at Navarro Junior College and teaching at high school, junior college and university levels. She has been editor of the *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors* since 1972 and has recently served a three-year term as president of the national council of Alpha Lambda Delta. She is author of *UT Austin Traditions and Nostalgia* (Shoal Creek, 1975) and is currently helping prepare a pictorial history of The University of Texas.

Preface

During the eight years I have served as editor of *The Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, the most discussed topic in the *Journal* has been women in educational administration.

Why has our professional journal suddenly shifted from one concerned primarily with student personnel services to one largely concerned with the position of women in leadership positions in educational administration? Through the years, the *Journal* has reflected surges of social change. During the seventies, the women's movement, with its charges of sexism and bias, became an all-important issue. Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments, for instance, aroused a considerable amount of interest in the position of women on our campuses and served as a means of consciousness raising for women never before equaled in academe. It is appropriate that the *Journal* of an association made up primarily of women administrators provide for its readers current research, developments, and ideas related to their own profession.

Viewing human development and learning as life-long processes, the leaders of our Association have insisted on quality service at all levels of education through performance of functions such as guidance, counseling, advising, administration, research, or teaching in an educational institution or agency. We have not strayed from our purpose. We are still interested in human development and learning and in related programs, and we are deeply interested in quality performance. We simply believe that more women should be involved in the administration of educational institutions and programs. Even though doors have been opened to more women, discrimination cases have been won by them, and myths about women in administration have been discredited, the cold fact is that among educational administrators women are still a small minority.

Before 1974, relatively few articles had been written about women in educational administration. The *Journal* issued a call for manuscripts on the subject and received excellent response. Fourteen were published in two special issues in the spring and summer, 1975. The large overrun from the printer was quickly sold out. Since then, other well prepared manuscripts on the subject have been published in the *Journal*.

At a recent Executive Board meeting of the Association, the editor was asked to pull out of recent issues of the *Journal* a group of articles about women in educational administration and prepare them for publication by the Association. This book is the result. Several other new, heretofore unpublished manuscripts are included. We hope the book will be useful as a reference or textbook for courses in educational administration and women's studies.

The Association expresses appreciation to all of the authors. We are also indebted to members of the *Journal* Board who reviewed the original manuscripts and to our colleagues who helped edit them. All proceeds from the book beyond actual cost will go to the NAWDAC.

Margaret C. Berry
Editor

November, 1979

Contents

v *Preface*

1 Why Don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education?
Sylvia-Lee Tibbets

12 Training Women for Administration
Rae Andre and Mary I. Edwards

19 Kindergarten: The Training Ground for Women in Administration
Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

24 Performance of Women Principals: Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies
Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker

32 Our Dwindling National Resource: Women School Administrators
Laurine E. Fitzgerald

37 Upward Job Mobility for Women in Elementary Education
Jane K. MacDonald

42 Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities
Edward J. Van Meir

47 Wonderland and Looking-Glass: Women in Administration
Eleanor M. Schetlin

53 Roadblocks to Women's Careers in Educational Administration
Gregory C. Coffin and Ruth B. Ekstrom

63 Women in Higher Education Administration
Nancy Pekin Cummings

70 Interest and Involvement of Women in University Governance
Julia K. Muller

76 An Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Women Administrators in Higher Education
Mary Elizabeth Reeves

79 An Analysis of Differences in Professional Attitudes and Beliefs between Male and Female Members of the College Student Personnel Profession
Marylu McEwen and Bruce Shertzer

87 Composite Profile of a Top-Level California Community College Woman Administrator
Virginia T. Pfiffner

90 Women College and University Presidents: Their Personal and Professional Characteristics, Career Development Patterns, and Opinions about their Roles
Martha McGee

101 Women as Academic Administrators in the Age of Affirmative Action
Marian Lief Palley

109 In Defense of the Dean of Women: A New Role for a New World
Jean Gillies

114 A Critical Look at the Queen Bee Syndrome
Jane Berry and Richard Kushner

118 Sex Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate Against Themselves
Sylvia-Lee Tibbetts

125 Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration
R. Susan Gordon and Patricia G. Ball

130 Survival Dynamics Revisited: A Reaction to Twenty Strategies
Dorothy I. MacConkey

136 Minding Our "P's" and Q's": Notes for Women in Higher Education Administration
Stephanie M. Bennett

146 Observations on . . .
Women in Higher Education Administration
Bette J. Soldwedel

150 How Do Women Administrators View Job Satisfaction and Discrimination?
Judith Cochran

153 Women Presidents: The First Fifty Years
Josephine Johnson and Charles R. O'Brien

156 The Profile and Status of N.A.W.D.A.C. Members, 1976
Bette J. Soldwedel

163 A Leap of Faith: Or How to Beat the Middle Management Syndrome
Barbara Baxter Pillinger

169 The Time to be Properly Vicious
Jo Ann Fley

174 "Hurry Up Please It's Time"
Helen S. Garson

181 Index

1 Why Don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education?

SYLVIA-LEE TIBBETTS

Although women "predominate in the professional ranks from which school administrators are recruited" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977), men outnumber women by a wide margin in positions at all levels of educational administration (Clement, 1975; Sexton, 1976). According to data available in 1973, two-thirds of America's classroom teachers, but only 15% of the principals, are women (Clement, *et al.*, 1977; Fishel & Pottker, 1973; Meskin, 1974; Pallante & Hilton, 1977; Sexton, 1976); and 99.4% of the medium- and large-sized superintendencies (80% of all superintendencies) are occupied by men (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). The same pattern of male dominance is found in state and federal departments of education and "even in the leadership of teacher organizations, although women far outnumber males in the ranks of these organizations" (Sexton, 1976). Consequently, "decision making in education at the local, state and federal levels is a male activity" (Hulett, 1977).

A number of reasons have been advanced to account for the scarcity of women in educational administration: (1) men make better principals than do women; (2) neither men nor women like working for women bosses;(3) qualified women are not available; (4) women abandon their careers for marriage and children; and (5) there is discrimination in hiring. While most of these reasons undoubtedly help, to some extent, to explain the lack of women in educational leadership, the reason most commonly advanced and generally accepted is that (6) women do not aspire to leadership positions and rarely apply for them (Cairns, 1975; Fishel & Pottker, 1973; Lupini, 1975). Some writers argue that this lack of aspiration is a "myth" (Young, 1976) — "Women have the same career ambitions as men, but they do not have the same opportunities" (Ortiz & Covel, 1978) — but the evidence indicates that their own lack of ambition may be "the crucial issue" (Pallante & Hilton, 1977); women may be their own most effective obstacle to career advancement. Barter (1959) — who found that 46% of male elementary teachers, but only 7.8% of women elementary teachers expressed an interest

Dr. Tibbetts has recently completed the Ph.D. at the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania. At the time this paper was prepared, she was a reading tutor at the Community College of Philadelphia.

in becoming an elementary school principal (Van Meir, 1975) — asserts, "the apathetic attitude of women teachers toward administrative appointments emerges as a key factor in their present status"; and, in research reported by Hulett (1977), "perhaps the most significant findings relate to aspiration . . . when women educators were asked if they aspired to an administrative post, 93% said 'no'." Even acquiring an advanced degree doesn't necessarily mean that the individual is interested in further advancement:

> It has been argued that even those women who have gone on to receive advanced degrees do not want to become administrators and it is this lack of ambition that accounts for their small numbers in administration positions (Fishel & Pottker, 1973).

On the face of it, it would seem to be curious that women are not sufficiently attracted by the greater prestige and financial rewards of administrative positions to apply for them. Given that a disproportionately larger number of women than men do not aspire to leadership positions in education, why don't they? It has been suggested that women, unburdened by the male affliction of needing to "prove" themselves (Tibbetts, 1977) are thus free to take advantage of their social license to accomplish little or nothing and, feeling that administrative positions demand too much work, decide they're simply not worth the effort. But this is only one of many hypotheses proposed to explain women's seeming reluctance to put forth the effort necessary to climb to the top. The literature is full of explanations — all of them plausible — none of them, certainly, the entire answer. A number of them are discussed here.

Sexist Socialization of Males and Females

Members of both sexes are thralls of sexist indoctrination, and it is probably nobody's fault that women continue to mindlessly follow the dictates of a sexist society (Tibbetts, 1975b). "The sex-role stereotypes that are pervasive in our culture have produced generations of persons who operate, as they must, within the frameworks and limitations of their own socialization" (Grambs, 1976). These stereotypes have led both men and women to believe that women should play subordinate roles in society (Bach, 1976). Specifically, they operate "to limit the participation of women in higher education and subsequently the professions" (Damico & Nevill, 1978). Women's aspirations are "chilled," not only by the "image of the dependent female" that "haunts us all" (Bach, 1976), but also by the "women's place" concept that inhibits both men and women from seeing women as aspirants or achievers of leadership positions in school administration (Grambs, 1976). Furthermore, "as a result of years of sex role stereotyping via the socialization process, both males and females fail to recognize indirect discrimination because it is built into the system" (Dietsch, 1978). Little wonder, then, that it is difficult for anybody — male or female — "to perceive any woman as capable of leading others" (Bach, 1976).

The Effects of Education

Sex differences in vocational preferences are already well developed in childhood (Iglitzin, 1972; Looft, 1971; Tibbetts, 1975a), and this is believed to be partly because the educational system promotes "occupational choices for female students which are in line with the existing sex-typing of occupations" (Cairns, 1975). This, in turn, and as a long-range consequence, contributes to the poor representation of women in leadership positions (Lupini, 1975).

> The curriculum of most school systems, both consciously and unconsciously, prepares males for leadership roles and females for subordinate, helping roles. Schools transmit the prevailing culture (Cronin, cited in Thurston, 1975.)

"The most obvious evidence of sexism in the schools is the percentage of women actually assuming leading roles in education" (Goerss, 1977); women "do not generally occupy positions of authority in equal proportion to their numbers in the profession" (McCune & Matthews, 1975). By placing women in positions subordinate to men, "the staffing patterns in school serve to prepare students to accept the inequities that society practices" (Sadker & Sadker, 1974). In addition, "those who believe that schools are perpetuating stereotypes especially harmful to girls, cite teacher attitudes, dress codes, assignment of chores, counseling practices, textbook content, segregation of classes, athletic programs and emphasis on the importance of boys' sports, and the teacher-principal relationship as areas where damaging sex-role stereotyping is evident" (Tibbetts, 1976).

However, Lupini (1975) placed educational practices and materials where they belong in acknowledging that the educational system is but a reflection of community values — of "a society that is sexist" (Goerss, 1977). The educational milieu is only one part of the sexist environment in which we are all marinated.

Sexist Socialization of Women

The "female" role or "woman's place"

Females are trained to accept a narrow, restricting, societal definition of their role (Cairns, 1975) that tells them what they can and cannot do and be. "Society is continually telling girls that certain activities are for women and others are for men" (McMillin, 1975). Males are similarly afflicted, of course; sexism cuts both ways (Tibbetts, 1977), but sex-role stereotyping is more restrictive for women, especially in the area of jobs, where "the range of occupational choice is much narrower for women than for men" (Cairns, 1975). In the past, society has demanded that women who work outside the home remain in the "appropriate" service careers of nursing, secretarial work, teaching and home economics "because of their usefulness for future homemakers and mothers" (Cirincione-Coles, 1975). Perhaps women have been slow to express their frustration and indignation with such limited career roles because they have been socialized to experience achievement and satisfaction vicariously, through an alliance with a "significant other"

for whom they function in a supportive capacity (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). That means that a woman is expected to find "fulfillment" in being so-and-so's wife, mother, daughter, sister, or what-have-you, and act always to bolster and buttress others, not to be successful in her own right.

Another, powerful deterrent to the career aspirations of women is the stereotyped concept of the nature and personality of women. Because femininity has been equated with either the absence or repression of aggression, women who strive for independence and intellectual achievement "may be thought of or may think themselves as acting in opposition to the conventions of sex-appropriate behavior" (Cairns, 1975). The qualities associated with top-level administration — leadership, intellectual achievement, competence, independence and competition — are also associated with masculinity and are thus inconsistent with the popular concept of femininity (Nieboer, 1975).

The behaviors designated as feminine are "deficient with respect to the general standards for adult behavior" (Broverman, *et al.*, 1972). "Healthy" women are expected to be "more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, more easily influenced, less aggressive, less competitive . . more emotional . . . less objective," in relation to "healthy" men (Broverman, *et al.*, 1972). As Broverman, *et al.* (1970) observed, the whole constellation of stereotypical feminine characteristics "seems a most unusual way of describing any mature, healthy individual."

When one considers the traditional stereotypes of feminine and masculine characters, it becomes evident that "to pursue higher education and/or careers forces [women] to assume personality traits which may be opposite from those of their early socialization experiences" (Damico & Nevill, 1978), and some women are afraid of stepping beyond the limited boundaries of "acceptable" behavior as they understand it. "The inhibitions of the 'woman's place' model is [sic] undoubtedly a strong factor in keeping many women from aspiring for career advancement in many work situations (Grambs, 1976)."

Women's internalization of their "inferiority"

"Women, more than any other group, have been subjugated by ancient and universal edicts declaring their eternal inferiority" (Bach, 1976). Unfortunately, instead of giving this nonsense the attention it deserves — none — many women have internalized these false, repressive and debilitating feelings of inferiority to such an extent that they themselves doubt that any woman can be fit to lead (Smith, 1976). They sell themselves short and expect little of other women. The tendency is to feel that if a woman is successful, she must be some sort of genius to have made it in spite of her dreadful handicap of being female (Diamond, 1975). Evidence suggests that women accept their inferior status as genuine (Tibbetts, 1975b): "the fact that female high school graduates have higher achievement records and lower vocational goals than males may suggest an acceptance by women of their 'inferior status' and its legitimacy" (Pallante & Hilton, 1977).

Fear of rejection — and the "motive to avoid success"

Fear of social rejection "seems to be a factor in the perpetuation of behavior that is consistent with traditional sex-role stereotyping" (Burlin, 1976), leading women "to get trapped in narrow, specialized jobs which represent a psychological investment in security and recognition" (Thurston, 1975). Some women may feel "threatened" by what they perceive as the negative consequences of success (Cairns, 1975), and fear that if they are successful, they will, for having broken away from the feminine stereotype, be labeled as "deviant and asexual" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977) and rejected for being "unfeminine" (Burlin, 1976). These perceived consequences, quite logically, "act as barriers to women's occupational aspirations" (Cohen, *et al.*, 1978). Cairns (1975) reports that in one study of 226 female teachers, one factor that received emphasis was "the conflicting roles women in the professions are expected to fulfill and the unpleasant consequences attached to failing to be seen as adequately filling a rather narrowly defined feminine sex role." Thus, significant problems facing the contemporary woman appear to be role definition and conflict between varying role expectations (Damico & Nevill, 1978), and this suggests that the prejudice against women as potential administrators derives not exclusively from the male establishment, but from women's own attempts at establishing acceptable social selves. The move from the "traditionally female" job of teaching into administrative areas may be perceived as undesirable for the woman who is concerned with maintaining her own and others' perceptions of herself as feminine (Cairns, 1975), and "since many women feel they will be rejected if they seem overly competent, they hesitate to assume the leadership role, even if they are in the official leadership position" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977).

Women have been conditioned to avoid success (Zakrajsek, 1976). According to one hypothesis introduced by Horner in 1968 and widely-cited ever since, "most women have a motive to avoid success because they expect negative consequences (such as social rejection and/or feelings of being unfeminine) as a result of succeeding" (Horner, 1972), at least, for succeeding in traditionally male fields. Some women feel that intellectual achievement would mean such an extensive loss of their femininity that it would cause men to reject them (McCune & Matthews, 1976), endangering their heterosexual relationships (Tibbetts, 1975b). "The more self-reliant, assertive and achieving she becomes, the more she jeopardizes her feminine image" (Berger, 1977). Therefore, "for a woman to have a self concept which incorporates the qualities of leadership, she must come to terms with society's interpretation that she is not 'feminine' " (Nieboer, 1975), and some women who could be successful in career roles are, instead, "blocked by society's trump card: the feeling that one cannot have a career and be a successful woman simultaneously" (Bem & Bem, 1973).

Lack of Encouragement

> While it is true that women teachers do not aspire or prepare for administrative jobs to the same extent as male teachers, . . . studies have also shown that women teachers are discouraged from seeking administrative appointments (Fishel & Pottker, 1975).

Having seen how difficult it is for a woman teacher to obtain an administrative position, many have stopped trying (Fishel & Pottker, 1973). They apply only in small numbers "out of an awareness of the relatively small likelihood of their application meeting with success" (Cairns, 1975).

"Typically, women are encouraged to fail" (Epstein, 1974), not only by the generally sexist societal view of women who dare to be successful in traditionally male jobs, but by more specific, on-the-job factors such as "differential reward systems, discrimination in pay or promotions, and lack of support for professional growth" (Rizzo, 1978). Through "overt sex discrimination, such as formal organizational rules and regulations calling for differential treatment based solely on sex" (Hollon & Gemmill, 1976), "organizations have traditionally communicated to women that their advancement potential is limited. The internalization of these messages by women partially explains the low attractiveness of the organizations for females" (Rizzo, 1978).

Lack of leadership expectations

"Most women, regardless of their capability, never consider a career in administration" (Dietsch, 1978), because women are not perceived — by men or by women — as having the potential to manage (Bartol & Butterfield, 1976). McMillin (1975) studied leadership aspirations of prospective male and female teachers and found that among the women "the likelihood of accepting leadership in a school or educational organization decreased as the level of responsibility increased," and concluded that "these women may have internalized the concept that high-level leadership roles are for men and not for women."

Job incompatibility

Some women may avoid supervisory positions because they see them as incompatible with the feminine role. Cohen, *et al.*, (1978) found that "for females only . . . the more traditionally incongruent the supervisory situation, the more likely that unfavorable reactions to supervision would prevail." Teaching, of course, especially at lower levels, is an acceptable feminine occupation, and Grambs (1976) perceives the typical elementary teacher as one who views that position as "feminine" and "compatible with her view of herself as a woman." She does not aspire beyond it, indoctrinated as she is with the belief that assertive behavior of the sort needed to move into administration "is a violation of the feminine sex role and is likely to be followed by either less reinforcement or outright punishment" (Hedrick & Chance, 1977).

Few mentors and role models

"One of the major problems facing the woman who wishes to rise to the top level of her profession is that of leadership image . . . . Role models or identification models of behavior are essential for the development of a self-concept" (Nieboer, 1975), yet there are too few models of women in leadership positions for females to emulate. Our social system "directly restricts the visibility of qualified women," and "denies women the possibility of gaining support and confidence from other women" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977).

Neither are there enough successful women to provide mentorship to young women, and mentorship provided by men "does not completely erase the handicap brought about by the lack of women in positions of educational administration" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). The mentor assists in the creation of competence, so necessary to success, and a result of on-the-job training — exposure to the tasks, and opportunities to "learn the techniques and avoid the pitfalls." But this on-the-job training "is given only when important gatekeepers decide that a person has talent and that he or she will continue to perform well." Since "women do not fit the image of competence held in the society," it is often impossible for them or any others, "aspiring but unwanted," to acquire the necessary training for competence in an informal professional setting through the mentorship of an older and more experienced partner (Epstein, 1974).

Outright Discouragement of Women

Sex typing of jobs

"Traditionally in American society, jobs have been sex-typed into 'male' and 'female' occupations which support the generally accepted, traditional role structure in society" (Rizzo, 1978). The sex-typing of a job tends to place it psychologically off-limits for members of the opposite sex, and the fact that the principalship, for example, has been dominated by men sex-types the job so that it "tends to attract or be allocated to members of only one sex regardless of the qualifications of individual members of the other sex" (Pallante & Hilton, 1977). Women teachers may perceive that their school system has the unstated policy of "women need not apply" (Lupini, 1975) for administrative positions, because males are preferred.

Negative concept of the woman boss

A potent deterrent to the administrative ambitions of some women is the negative concept of the woman boss, an image shared by both men and women of a female who is "masculine, aggressive, 'castrating,' bitchy and harsh" (Grambs, 1976). The "castrating female" is described as "an image which haunts the modern woman and warns her to suppress her natural assertive strivings" (Fodor in Cairns, 1975). Since women probably do not want to be perceived as such a stereotype (Grambs, 1976), they tend to avoid positions where they fear they might be so regarded.

The female administrator also suffers from a damned-if-she-does-damned-if-she-doesn't predicament. If she is assertive and strong-minded, she is considered to be aggressive and tough; if jovial and casual, she is too permissive (Smith, 1976); if she chooses to be a "good" ("masculine") administrator, she is hard-headed, high-powered, overbearing and excessively ambitious; but if she is "feminine," she is not fulfilling managerial duties and responsibilities (Rizzo, 1978).

Lack of support from male peers

Even if a woman achieves an administrative position, she will not receive the same sort of support from her male colleagues as the men receive from one another (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). Women who feel that the likelihood of

being accepted by males — especially males in a subordinate role — is too small to risk a life style change (Cohen, *et al.*, 1978), may be reluctant to give up the camaraderie of female co-workers in order to seek promotion into managerial ranks (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). The realization that they face potential rejection by subordinates and peers may serve to divert their interest from positions in traditionally male-oriented occupations (Cohen, *et al.*, 1978), where they would have to "go it alone" among men who may not fully back them.

No "old girl" system

The "old boy" network is an extremely useful and effective informal system of communication used by men (Thurston, 1975). Through this system, "men provide information to colleagues and mentorship to younger male aspirants" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). It functions as a "network of hiring [that] has survived by currying favor for privileged males" (Rizzo, 1978), but it is not open to women, and women do not receive the job information that normally flows through it" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). The fact that women are systematically excluded from making use of this valuable "grapevine" — and have no comparable "old girl" network — has serious consequences for them. "Information is withheld, important interpersonal support networks cannot be developed, and the display of talents, skills, and knowledge is confined to the formal structure" (Ortiz & Covel, 1978). The exclusion of women from such a social network system is one example of how "female managers experience a different relationship with the organization than their male counterparts." They "are denied many of the informal signs of belonging and recognition shared by males" (Rizzo, 1978).

Pay discrepancies

For various reasons, women too-frequently end up at the short end of the wage scale. It seems to be partly because of the nature of the jobs, since "in every category of occupations, women are employed in the lesser-skilled, lower paid positions" (Bem & Bem, 1975). While one might expect that this is partly because of poorer education, "a female college graduate working full-time can expect to earn less per year than a male high school dropout" (Bem & Bem, 1975). This, then, would indicate that the lower-paid women were in the "lesser-skilled, lower-paid positions," regardless of their education. But even those women in administration who are holding jobs comparable to men in administration are paid less than men. "The National Bureau of the Census reported in 1970 that the average salary of female administrators in elementary and secondary education was almost $5,000 less than that of males" (Clement, *et al.*, 1977). These differential reward structures and pay scales for women probably "influence their perception of the attractivenss of the organizations" (Rizzo, 1978), and help to discourage any interest women might have in administration.

Prejudicial evaluation

"Prejudicial evaluation of women's work has been offered as an explanation for the apparent failure of women to achieve as much success as men" (Mischel, 1974). "Women have lived throughout much of history as a

devalued subgroup" (Shainess, 1969). Femininity and being female is socially underrated by women as well as by men (Baumrind, 1972; Goldberg, 1968; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; Tibbetts, 1975b), and this debasement extends to what they do, as well. There is a most pernicious tendency to devalue the work of women — because it is done by women. As Mead (1949) so astutely observed, whatever men do, be it cooking, dressing dolls or hunting hummingbirds, so long as these are the appropriate occupations of men in that society, they are the important activities; and the occupations performed by women are considered, by both men and women, to be less important.

The tendency to evaluate performance by sex of performer extends to management. Bartol & Butterfield (1976) found that "identical leader behavior was evaluated differently depending upon whether the leader was male or female," and, although evaluations of females were not all negative, they were not the same as the evaluations of males, and this indicated "the existence of strong sex stereotypes for managers . . . at the present time, different standards are being used to evaluate male and female managers." The effect of an individual's sex "does have substantial biasing effect on the evaluation of his or her achievements" (Mischel, 1974), and "widely shared sex-role stereotypes may result in personnel decisions which are based on unwarranted performance inferences"(Rose & Stone, 1978).

When one considers the factors that can affect a woman's choice of a career role, it should be clear that one cannot dismiss the apparent lack of feminine ambition by indicating that the responsibility for her own motivation lies with the woman. To do so is to ignore the sexist socialization which has taught both males and females that women are incompetent to lead. One cannot say that a woman who elects not to apply for a leadership position has chosen freely. Her options have been made clear to her by a society that has selected them for her. "The so-called freedom-to-choose is illusory, and it cannot be invoked to justify the society which controls the motivation to choose" (Bem & Bem, 1975).

References

Bach, L. Of women, school administration, and discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1976, **57**(7), 463-466.

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration. *The Education Digest*, 1959, **25**(2), 40-41.

Bartol, K.M., & Butterfield, D.A. Sex effects in evaluating leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1976, **61**(4), 446-454.

Baumrind, D. From each according to her ability. *School Review*, 1972, **80**(2), 161-197.

Bem, S.L. & Bem, D.J. On liberating the female student. *The School Psychology Digest*, 1973, **2**(3), 10-18.

Bem, S.L. & Bem, D.J. *Training the woman to know her place: The social antecedents of women in the world of work*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1975.

Berger, G. The socialization of American females as a dysfunctional process: Selected research. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1977, **10**(4), 3-11.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, **34**(1), 1-7.

Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, **28**(2), 59-78.

Burlin, F.D. Sex-role stereotyping: Occupational aspirations of female high school students. *The School Counselor*, 1976, **24**(2), 102-108.

Cairns, K.V. Women and school administration. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 1975, **9**(3), 165-175.

Cirincione-Coles, K. The administrator: Male or female? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1975, **26**(4), 326-328.

Clement, J.P. Dimensions of the problem. *Sex bias in school leadership*. Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1975.

Clement, J.P., DiBella, C.M., Eckstrom, R.B., & Tobias, S. No room at the top? *American Education*, 1977, **13**(5), 20-23, 26.

Cohen, S.L., Bunker, K.A., Burton, A.L., & McManus, P.D. Reactions of male subordinates to the sex-role congruency of immediate supervision. *Sex Roles*, 1978, **4**(2), 297-311.

Damico, S.P. & Nevill, D. Education and role conflict: A woman's dilemma. *Educational Horizons*, 1978, **56**(3), 140-143.

Diamond, H. Wanted: More women in management. *Educational Horizons*, 1975, **53**(3), 125-128.

Dietsch, C. The sin of omission. *American Secondary Education*, 1978, **8**(2), 61-62.

Epstein, C.F. Women *vs.* success. *Educational Horizons*, 1974, **52**(3), 107-109.

Fishel, A., & Pottker, J. Women lose out: Is there sex discrimination in school administration? *The Clearing House*, 1973, **47**(7), 387-391.

Fishel, A., & Pottker, J. Performance of women principals: A review of behavioral and attitudinal studies. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1975, **38**(3), 110-117.

Fodor, I.E. Sex-role conflict and symptom-formation in women: Can behavior therapy help? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 1974, **11**(1), 22-29. Cited in Cairns, 1975.

Goerss, K.V. SEXISM: A challenge for school counselors. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1977, **40**(3), 104-107.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? *Trans-Action*, 1968, **5**(5), 28-30.

Grambs, J.D. Women and administration: Confrontation or accommodation? *Theory Into Practice*, 1976, **15**(4), 293-300.

Hedrick, T.E. & Chance, J.E. Sex differences in assertive achievement patterns. *Sex Roles*, 1977, **3**(2), 129-139.

Hollon, C.J. & Gemmill, G.R. A comparison of female and male professors on participation in decision making, job related tension, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1976, **12**(1), 80-93.

Horner, M.S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, **28**(2), 157-175.

Hulett, S.A. Women administrators in Missouri. *School and Community*, 1977, **43**(5), 16, 27.

Iglitzin, L.B. A child's-eye view of sex roles. *Today's Education*, 1972, **61**(9), 23-25.

Looft, W.R. Sex differences in the expression of vocational aspirations by elementary school children. *Developmental Psychology*, 1971, **5**(2), 366.

Lupini, D. Women in administration: Where are they? *Education Canada*, 1975, **15**(4), 17-22.

McCune, S.D. & Matthews, M. Eliminating sexism: Teacher education and change. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1975, **26**(4), 294-300.

McMillin, M.R. Leadership aspirations of prospective teachers — A comparison of men and women. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1975, **26**(4), 323-325.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. The differential evaluation of males and females. *Journal of Personality*, 1957, **25**(3), 356-371.

Mead, M. *Male and female*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1949.

Meskin, J.D. The performance of women school administrators — A review of the literature. *Administrator's Notebook*, 1974, **23**(1), 1-4.

Mischel, H.N. Sex bias in the evaluation of professional achievements. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1974, **66**(2), 157-166.

Nieboer, N.A. "There is a certain kind of woman . . ." *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1975, **38**(3), 99-103.

Ortiz, F.I. & Covel, J. Women in school administration. *Urban Education*, 1978, **13**(2), 213-236.

Pallante, J.J. & Hilton, C.L. Authority positions for women: Principalships in public education. *Contemporary Education*, **48**(4), 1977, 206-210.

Rizzo, A.M. Perceptions of membership and women in administration: Implications for public organizations. *Administration and Society*, **10**(1), 1978, 33-48.

Rose, G.L. & Stone, T.H. Why good job performance may (not) be rewarded: Sex factors and career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1978, **12** 197-207.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. Sexism in schools: An issue for the 70's. *The Education Digest*, 1974, **39**(8), 58-61.

Sexton, P. *Women in education*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.

Shainess, N. Images of women: Past and present, overt and obscured. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 1969, **23**, 77-97.

Sherriffs, A.C. & McKee, J.P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. *Journal of Personality*, 1957, **25**(4), 451-464.

Smith, R.A. Women administrators — Is the price too high? *NASSP Bulletin*, 1976, **60**(399), 99-103.

Thurston, A.J. A woman president? — A study of two-year college presidents. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1975, **38**(3), 118-123.

Tibbetts, S. Sex-role stereotyping in the lower grades: Part of the solution. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1975a, **6**, 255-261.

Tibbetts, S. Sex-role stereotyping: Why women discriminate against themselves. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1975b, **38**(4), 177-183.

Tibbetts, S. Elementary schools: Do they stereotype or feminize? *Journal of the NAWDAC*, 1976, **40**(1), 27-33.

Tibbetts, S. Sex-role stereotyping and its effects on boys. *Journal of the NAWDAC*, 1977, **40**(3), 108-112.

Van Meir, E.J. Sexual discrimination in school administration opportunities. *Journal of the NAWDAC*, 1975, **38**(4), 163-167.

Young, C.K. Women in school administration and supervision: A new leadership dimension. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1976, **60**(400), 33-87.

Zakrajsek, B. Obtaining a principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1976, **60**(399), 94-98.

2 Training Women for Administration

RAE ANDRÉ AND MARY I. EDWARDS

> If women are thinly represented on faculties, especially in traditionally male fields, they are so rarely represented in top academic administrative positions as to be practically non-existent.
>
> *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, September, 1973.

The Carnegie Commission Report documents a well-known fact of academic life: the higher you go in the academic hierarchy, the fewer women you find. Despite wide recognition of this problem, and despite the pressures applied by affirmative action programs, change has been slow. Indeed, when we look ahead to an era of reduced university growth it is possible that the number of women in senior positions will actually decline. The need for effective programs for moving women into administration is magnified under these circumstances, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing programs becomes even more essential. In this context it is important to take a hard look at training programs, one of the most popular strategies of the 1970s for facilitating the entry of women into academic administration.

Six such programs have been developed since 1973, ranging from weekend conferences designed to explore career paths in administration to full-time internships of up to ten months. The early programs were founded on the assumption that faculty women needed compensatory education because they had been excluded from both formal and informal training experiences which prepared male faculty for senior administrative posts.

The first of the institutes designed specifically for faculty women was the Institute for Administrative Advancement (IAA). Sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and by the Ford Foundation, it was originally held at the University of Michigan in 1973. The program moved in the following year to the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where it is still housed. The IAA offered a six-week residential program which attracted a nationally selected audience, and stressed information delivered through lecture and seminar discussions with senior administrators and academicians in the field of higher education administration.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Fall, 1978). Dr. André is instructor in organizational psychology at the General Motors Institute, and Dr. Edwards is coordinator of academic affairs, College of L.S.A., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

In the same year the University of Michigan's Alumnae Council independently initiated an internship program for women. The eight-month internships with senior administrators at Michigan were awarded to recent Ph.D. recipients who intended to seek faculty positions leading to careers in academic administration. Three interns per year were chosen in 1974 and 1975, two in 1976. Since 1976 the internship program has developed into a summer seminar in academic administration.

In 1974 the Carnegie Corporation funded the Administrative Intern Program for Women in Higher Education (AIP), located at Cedar Crest College and serving a consortium of sixteen small colleges. Ten-month internships were offered each year to sixteen alumnae of the participating colleges. The AIP is distinguished from other programs described here by the fact that its interns do not necessarily have advanced degrees; many are recent graduates of the participating colleges.

In the same year Carnegie funded another internship program "for mature faculty women" at the Claremont Colleges in California. This program lasted two years, from 1974 to 1976, and brought four faculty fellows to Claremont each year to prepare them for administrative positions.

More recently established programs for women have an increased emphasis on the managerial skills and fiscal knowledge that are generally seen as necessary for administrators of both sexes. They also take a broader perspective as to their constituency, welcoming many more women who have administrative but not necessarily faculty positions.

In 1976 Higher Education Resource Services (HERS)-MidAtlantic began the Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration, cosponsored by HERS-MidAtlantic and Bryn Mawr College and funded by the Donner Foundation. Like the IAA, the Summer Institute is a residential program, although its audience has become national in scope. The Summer Institute stresses the creation of professional networks and uses the case study method of instruction. Within the Institute in 1976 was also a 3-day Career Exploration Seminar.

Building upon the experience of its sister program, in 1977 HERS-New England began the Administrative Skills Program for Women, a series of six weekend seminars held at Wellesley College. This program began too recently to be included in our study.

Procedure

To determine the impact of the training programs and to derive some suggestions for the design of future programs, we queried participants of training programs from 1973 to 1977 (excluding the 1977 Summer Institute). The ninety women (out of 250 surveyed) who answered our questionnaire ranged in age from 23 to 57, with a median age of 34. Fifty-three percent hold the Ph.D., 35% the M.A. or M.S. degree, and 10% the B.A. Twenty percent paid for their training themselves; 64% were fully supported by their institutions and 16% were partially supported by their institutions.

Seven men also returned the questionnaire, but because of their small representation in the programs their data are not included with those of the women.

Of the ninety respondents, 29% had attended the Institute for Administrative Advancement, 18% the Administrative Intern Program for Women (AIP), 31% the Summer Institute at Bryn Mawr, 12% the Career Exploration Seminar at Bryn Mawr, and 10% the Internship and Summer Seminar at the University of Michigan.

The respondents answered a primarily open-ended two-page questionnaire. Participants were asked to assess the impact of the training on their present jobs, the usefulness of specific program content, the validity of the overall program design, and the applicability of the program to the institution with which they are presently affiliated.

Findings

Participants reported a wide range of changes in career as a result of the training, from an observation that the training dashed the "mystique" of administration to many descriptions of significant improvements in salary and position. Reported changes were not always positive. Several respondents noted that they had rejected academic administration in favor of business; one asserted that she had lost her job at least in part because her superior was adamantly opposed to her attendance at a training program (on her vacation time).

Yet 36% of our respondents did report significant positive effects on careers. As a direct result of the training women were asked to accept more responsibility and to step into higher positions. Opportunities included requests to join important administrative committees and offers of positions as heads of departments and assistant deans. As a result of their training, women secured the following positions, among others: Assistant to the President of a small prestigious women's college, Assistant Dean of Instruction at a community college, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School at a university, administrator of a center for research on women, and a position as "one of five major administrators" at a small college. One woman attributed a $5,000 raise to the effects of her training; another became an assistant academic dean and doubled her salary.

Of course, positive change was not the whole story. Among those who reported no change in career as a result of the training, and 34% so indicated, several cited traditional barriers: "My college is still not willing to share top positions with women"; "I was told it is impossible to advance"; "I don't believe it is going to have any effect. I have been stereotyped as an affirmative action person."

Training programs are basically of two kinds, short-term summer institutes and longer internships programs, and our data show that programs which included internships had considerably higher percentages of people who reported a positive impact on their careers. Fifty-six percent of respondents in each of the two internship programs reported such positive changes, while training programs without internships had positive reports ranging from 9% to 32% of all participants.

Some respondents (31% of those who answered the questionnaire) did not mention a specific position change or career decision that followed from their training experience yet did indicate that changes of a less substantive

nature had occurred. Often these included increased assertiveness, self-confidence, and determination. As one woman put it, now "I say what I think and nobody stops me." Such attitude changes did affect career plans. For instance, one woman wrote that she is now "more inclined to go through the ordeal of calculus" in order to get her M.B.A. Additional reported changes included more visibility to superiors, the ability to be on top of current issues in higher education and thus to do well in job interviews, and increased ability to think broadly about university needs as opposed to departmental or unit needs.

We were interested in knowing who would be the most likely beneficiaries of training programs, and our study indicated several trends. First, it seems that training is a somewhat better investment for an institution than it is for an individual. Training financed by individuals was more likely to result in minor changes than in significant changes. In programs financed wholly by an individual's institution 40% of the respondents reported a significant impact. Of course, one explanation may be that individuals sponsored by an institution already occupy a position within the organization and thus have greater access to channels for advancement than do individuals outside of an organization.

At the same time, a program that was designed primarily for entry-level administrators, presumably those with B.A. and M.A. degrees, had twice as high a percentage of persons reporting a significant impact on careers as did Ph.D.-oriented programs. One factor here may be that there is more job mobility and availability in junior level administrative positions. Overall, women between the ages of 25 and 44 report a larger number of significant changes than either younger or older women.

We also wanted to know whether training transferred to the participants' home bases. Often the training programs were held in institutions with which the participants were not affiliated. In addition to the benefits for individuals, respondents reported some changes directly affecting their home institutions. Most women noted that such applications were indirect, including bringing the institution up to date on what was happening at other similar institutions and in higher education in general, and on how peer institutions operate. More specific applications were cited by one respondent who went home and wrote several institutional grant proposals, by another respondent who organized a state conference, and by respondents who applied their knowledge to immediate budgeting and management problems.

Another variable of great interest across programs is program content. To rate content participants were asked to state whether they found various program components to be "very useful," "somewhat useful," or "not at all useful." Among all programs, components that were most often rated "very useful" were information on university structure, information on budgets, and the experience of sharing the training with women. In the middle range, again in order of most to least useful, were personal friendships, professional contacts, information about state and federal relations, information about public relations, and information about legal issues. Least useful components were information about grantsmanship, information on computer resources, and the opportunity for direct job contacts. There were only minor differences in how these program components were rated across the

different programs. IAA participants rated information on state and federal relations second in usefulness, and many participants in that institute also mentioned that collective bargaining information had been a unique and worthwhile section.

For the most part, participants of different ages rated various program components similarly. The exceptions were that women under 25 rated the importance of forming personal friendships and the information about computer resources especially high, while women 45 and older rated the usefulness of job contacts especially low. Another trend was that the higher the participants' educational level, the more likely they were to cite information on state and federal relations and on legal issues as very useful.

Overall participants' rating of the usefulness of the program was strongly affected by how the program was financed: the more financial assistance the participant received, the more useful the program was rated.

That women rated sharing the training experience with other women as the third most important ingredient of the training experience deserves further elaboration. Forty percent of the participants rated sharing the training with women as "very useful," 53% rated it as "somewhat useful," and only 7% rated it as "not at all useful." When asked whether they thought such training programs should be designed specifically for women, 58% said yes, 18% expressed mixed feelings, and 24% said no. Women had many reasons for asserting that programs for women are needed. They stated that women "need special help in compensating for lack of an 'old girl system,'" that "whether we like to admit it or not, many women will defer to men in an argumentative situation," and that "for those who had never worked extensively with women I think it was a good experience to realize the strengths of women working together." One pointed out the positive role of the public recognition for such programs: "When the program is statedly for development of a pool of qualified women, cooperating institutions are made aware of the need to put more women into administrative positions."

On the other hand, some women felt that they obtain more accurate perceptions of their relative competence in a mixed group, that qualified women should get promotions and help getting jobs rather than special training, and that identifying a program for women is strategically unwise, stigmatizing the participant and thus adding to the handicaps women already have. A woman who expressed mixed feelings on this question wrote that "I really enjoyed being with women and the women there. It definitely gave us freedom to express and exchange concerns we could not do as easily if it were a mixed group. On the other hand, our vantage points were very similar and we did not broaden our perspectives greatly. We could have helped open some men's eyes, too, to the problems of career oriented and able women in academic administration."

The information from even our very limited sample of male participants is somewhat interesting in this context. Of the seven male respondents, two expressed mixed feelings about designing programs specifically for women, and five were against the idea. None expressed concern for women's special needs or awareness of unique ways women may have for working together. One of the two respondents who expressed mixed feelings stated that the diversity of sex, age, and background had been enriching; the other wrote

that "separate programs for women might be useful since there may be less tendency to get sidetracked," presumably onto "women's issues."

Implications and Conclusions

Our data have several implications for the design of future programs. To begin with, program constituency is clearly an important issue. Should programs be designed for both the M.A.-level and the Ph.D.-level participants simultaneously? Should they be designed for both men and women? In addition, what geographical constituency of participants will maximize program utility?

The placement success of the AIP, the only training program which serves B.A. and M.A. rather than Ph.D. holders, suggests that the entry level administrative jobs, while hardly an answer to the need for more women in senior posts, may provide an accessible and realistic market for young women who wish to test their administrative skills before committing themselves to long-term degree programs. Thus, at present, the M.A.-holding junior administrator seems to be a reasonable target for training. In the future, if the academic job market continues to shrink, junior administrative positions may attract academics with Ph.D.'s who seek to work in higher education despite the fact that the normal faculty route is closed to them. Whether the M.A. and Ph.D. holders have different training needs is an issue that needs further exploration. At this point a tenable hypothesis is that they do, and that programs should accordingly be differentially designed.

Our data indicate a continuing desire for programs designed specifically for women, while not rejecting the need for mixed programs. According to our respondents, the cliché that people need to train in as natural an environment as possible should be tempered by the fact that many women have found that sharing their training primarily with other women has fostered a cooperative rather than a competitive atmosphere, and many have experienced benefits from this so-called "unnatural" environment. Indeed, this cooperative atmosphere needs to be nurtured and studied, and perhaps fostered in the mixed institutes. If a female style of management exists, it is probably to be found in the ability and tendency to create more cooperative structures. Constituency of sex promises to continue to be a lively and important issue in program design.

In addition, the training programs we studied have served a variety of geographical constituencies: national, regional, and local. The first of the institutes (the IAA) has drawn a national audience of faculty and administrators. One problem with such a national constituency may be that it includes participants from diverse kinds of institutions — from small liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and public and private universities. Both locations of the IAA (The University of Michigan and The University of Wisconsin at Madison) have been large public universities, and their programs have tended to reflect that perspective. To some extent the interests of representatives of different kinds of institutions may be neglected. On the other hand, opportunities for cross-fertilization of ideas are excellent with such a diverse constituency.

Be that as it may, more recently established training programs (the Bryn Mawr Summer Institute and the Wellesley seminars) have more narrowly focused their geographical range. The Bryn Mawr training program originally served women in the MidAtlantic region and the new Wellesley program is targeted at New England women administrators. This change in focus comes in part from these programs' increasing attention to job placement. The Higher Education Resource Services have always sought to help women secure academic jobs and have assumed that a regional focus, particularly in these densely populated areas, was more practical for this purpose than a more diffuse national scope. The University of Michigan programs have recently developed an even more local orientation. Several of the interns have found administrative jobs within the University, and the summer seminar in academic administration has become most useful as a professional development program for University faculty and administrative staff. Clearly geographical constituency is an important consideration in program design. Our respondents show no clear mandate for any particular type of program; what seems most useful is maintaining a variety of programs aimed at meeting differing needs.

In closing, we wish to point out that our data also indicate some considerations for those individuals who are weighing the personal benefits of training programs. While further research needs to be done, some tentative conclusions are in order. Despite the evident benefits of administrative training programs for many academic women, it must be stressed that supplemental programs do not substitute for academic credentials: the terminal degree, the tenure-track position, or, in the case of senior administrative posts, the successful faculty career. The training programs seem to work best as an added credential for persons already "in place." An additional cautionary note may be in order. One possible effect of the predicted no-growth phase of higher education in the 1980s and '90s may be that tenured faculty, a group that is still predominantly male, may be increasingly attracted to administrative posts as their chances for mobility as faculty members decline. Even those women who have made it through to tenured positions may face increasingly stiff competition from male colleagues for senior administrative positions. This prediction argues not only for improved training but also for increased vigilance in enforcing affirmative action programs.

In summary, women who are considering entering a training program should be aware that the benefits of such a program are limited. Training is not a panacea; it may not be much help in improving one's position vis-a-vis administration unless one already has an entry level position. On the other hand, since training programs will introduce women to the general nature of administration, they can be useful in making or modifying career plans. They also provide access to female role models. They contribute to a woman's sense of professional identity, they increase her visibility, and they can provide access to important professional networks. Finally, for women with the appropriate credentials, a training program can lead to tangible rewards: raises, responsibility, and new opportunities.

3 Kindergarten: The Training Ground for Women in Administration

MARY ELLEN VERHEYDEN-HILLIARD

"Women in Administration" is a topic of proportions similar to "Evergreen Trees in the Forest." To have any lasting impact, the discussion should include not only the present condition of such trees, how they should be treated and what best use to make of them, but also a discussion of how to plant the seeds and nurture young trees in order to grow more and better evergreens in the future.

My thesis is that we will get just about as many highly placed women in administration as we are willing to grow, and that growth will require two things at least: people who will plant the seed of possibility in the minds of little girls and clear away the weeds of sex role stereotyping that choke the growth, plus people who will nurture the growth of healthy attitudes toward females in those others who are going to have to work with females — i.e., little boys. Presently, in my opinion, very little of either is going on.

Let us start with the last first. The cliché tells us that the battle was won on the playing fields of Eton; we may soon recognize that administrative women are lost on the playing fields of recess time.

John says: "Get away, we don't want any girls playing."

Mary says: "They won't let me play with them."

Educator says: "Well, that's the way boys are. They are too rough, anyway. Play with the girls."

Run that through again and put a minority group name in place of "girls."

For at least the ten years of their lives that boys spend in the obligatory school system of this country, they are allowed to put girls down, refuse to play with them, ignore them, make fun of them, humiliate them and ostracize them simply because they are girls.

If boys are supported and indeed encouraged in this behavior for all of their formative years ("boys will be boys"), there is no way to expect them to suddenly turn about as adults and see female peers as equals. Women have remained, and will remain, the little girls that society allowed and encouraged little boys to shove aside so that they could play with the boys without any interference — and they're still doing it when they're 45.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Summer, 1975), pp. 151-155. Ms. Verheyden-Hilliard is president of Verheyden & Associates, Washington, D.C.

The message conveyed to girls is that boys have a right to exclude them and that they are too weak to compete anyway. The girls retreat to the girls' games and the female careers where they have been forcefully told they belong.

The educational setting has traditionally encouraged the belief that boys and girls, males and females (men and women?) are natural enemies and feel antipathy for each other. The "Old Boys' Club" has its roots deep in the recess line, where the boys and girls were admonished to line up separately, and in the oft-heard threat, "John, if you don't behave you'll have to sit with the girls." Every time that threat is uttered, a seed is planted which will flower when the boy becomes a man who sees working with women as low status and working for women as the ultimate castration for being unworthy to work only with males.

This sexual separatism which is the hidden agenda of schooling is the foundation for sex role stereotyping which does the most damage to future aspirations and expectations. Girls learn to accept boys' definitions of where they can play and with whom they can play. Boys learn that they can, with impunity, define the boundaries of what girls can do. Girls learn that educators see them as so awful that close proximity to them in a work situation can be viewed as punishment. Boys see their desire to keep girls away from themselves as reinforced by teachers who tell them that being near girls is like being punished.

That is discrimination and that is stereotyping. And it will stick. People do not shed a ten-year habit with ease. The attitudes of school will remain at work. Female persons who absorb these sex role stereotypes and accept this discrimination are not likely to view themselves as candidates for administering mixed-sex units, although they may see themselves as administrators of other women. Presently women in administration, what few there are, are administering other women — women's programs, women's projects, women's colleges (a vanishing breed at that). They are still being told to go play with the "girls;" the "boys" will handle their own affairs. As in elementary school, where one of the boys coming to play girls' games is viewed as a signal honor, it has become the hallmark of excellence in some quarters to appoint a male president to a women's college. (Try that role reversal on, say, Princeton or Dartmouth or Harvard College. It would not, I judge, be viewed as a step forward.)

Male persons who have absorbed the sex role stereotyping of the unworthiness of female aspiration (he won't let her join his game) and the awfulness of having to join her, except in a condescending manner, are not likely to become men who view their spouse's career as equally important nor the physical care of children as equally their responsibility. Neither are they likely to be comfortable with women of equal power in a professional situation.

But we do very little about these pervasive expectations. And I believe that it is time we did. For every time we condone or encourage separate activities for boys and girls because they "won't" or "can't" play together, we pull another rung out of the success ladder of the woman in administration. We are encouraging a view of females as "different," as "strange," a difference based not on reality but on false views of "proper" sex role behavior.

Ten years ago Alice Rossi noted that the "good sweet girl" which the educational system encouraged was not going to turn into a scientist or scholar. I would add that she isn't going to turn into a high administrator, either. Twelve years ago Eleanor Maccoby reported that the people who monitored the Fels study — a longitudinal study of gifted girls and boys — said that the simplest predictor of whether a girl would grow into an intellectual person was whether she had been a tomboy at some point in her childhood. Coser and Rokoff have noted that women live with a "cultural mandate" that says that their first responsibility is to the family and that anything else is seen as a "disruption of the social order."

Many people know these studies and others like them. Yet how many react with disappointment if a little girl says that she prefers to play with her dolls and her tea set and that all she wants to be when she grows up is a mommy? How many little boys have told you lately that all they want to be when they grow up are daddies? The point is boys will grow up to be daddies, but we don't worry about that. We accept it as part of their lives. We worry about what their careers will be. Do you worry about what a little girl's career will be? Do you worry that she will take responsibility for her own life? Do you harbor a secret belief that no matter what else happens, it will be all right because she will find someone to take care of her? Do you worry that her life will be forever dependent on his, or that that dependence will probably eliminate her chance of rising to a high administrative position?

If we expect to develop women for high administrative positions, we must be willing to convey a message to little girls that they are responsible for their own lives, that it is at their peril that they take up the role of a satellite person, that they had better consider very carefully the views of the person with whom they are joining their lives, and, most importantly, that they had better try to find out whether those views are lip service which will evaporate when two careers have to be accommodated.

This is a mobile society. If you can't move, you can't rise. Although we all know an exception to that rule, we can note that it is just that — an exception. Search committees are not known for searching their own cupboards. They take airplanes to distant schools and industries. They raid the faculties and boardrooms of other institutions.

If one asked all those women who, upon being offered a super administrative position, would be prepared to ask, let alone expect, their husbands to move to the new job with them (the husbands thereby giving up their own jobs) to please stand up, I think I would hear very few chairs being pushed back. Note that I wrote "super" administrative position. I was trying to make it easy. Perhaps we might ask husbands to go if we were appointed president of Harvard or of General Motors (he might not go, but we would feel freer to ask). But those presidents, I believe, did not rise full grown when the earth opened on Boston Commons or in the middle of Dearborn. Presidents start somewhere else and gather experience in many places. The high administrators did not generally take up residence in the city of their future niche upon graduation. They took advantage of opportunities to move and to grow — they tested their capabilities and broadened their experience. They

spent a few years here and a year consulting there. They took leaves of absence from one job to try another. They moved. They were able to do that for one of two reasons. They remained single and no one thought the worse of them for that, or they married a person who would take care of the family responsibilities and make no conflicting demands on their mobility.

Should girls be socialized to do the same thing now? Should boys be socialized to give up an independent career, to take sole responsibility for the physical care of the family so that future wives can pursue a career unencumbered by responsibility to share in parenting or unhampered by the need to consider someone else's aspirations? I think not.

I do not believe that the present male definition of how to maintain a successful career in administration (or anything else) need be the standard to which women, hereinafter, must repair. Total role reversal will be no improvement. Role expansion and interchange will be. And that will require, among other things, affirmative action counseling.

We talk about serious careers for women, but we don't really mean what we say. We talk about women in administration, but we don't really mean that either. The underlying presumption of a girl's life is still that she will grow up to be a wife and mother and that everything else will have to fit around that. If we are not willing to deal with that stereotype, we are avoiding the core issue upon which all other stereotypes are founded. Either a little girl is brought up to believe that she has the right to choice, mobility and power, or she is not. You cannot have it both ways.

If we want women in administration, we will have to rear them, and we will have to rear the men who can live with them both at home and in the office. The sooner we start, the sooner we'll see results.

The next time you are talking to a girl or a young woman who tells you she is going to be a wife and mother when she grows up, take a deep breath, screw your courage to the sticking point (for it does take courage to go against tradition, as we all know) and offer some affirmative action counseling — i.e., remark that the divorce rate is up 109 percent since 1962 and rising. Ask her if she knows that anti-sex-discrimination laws hold that pregnancy is a temporary disability which need not force a woman out of a job or keep her from attaining a job. Tell her that birth rate figures indicate that by the time a woman is thirty her last child will be in school and that she can expect to live for fifty more years, approximately, after that happens. Say that dusting is not a full time occupation unless you are getting paid for it. Say that unless a woman stays married for 20 years (a choice that may not rest with her), she will not even collect social security as her husband's wife; if she hasn't worked, she will have none of her own.

Ask the girl or young woman if she has ever thought about being president of anything. Take her out and buy her a kickball. If you can, go down to see the principal about who is saying what to whom at recess time and who is condoning it. If it is too late for that, go see the head of the athletic department and find out what he (she?) is doing about sports for females. Take a copy of Title IX with you.

See to it that she sees some role models and visits their offices. The Education Task Force of the National Organization for Women in New Jersey located 200 women who were willing to come to speak in classes and

at career days in New Jersey schools. They ranged from union officials to funeral directors, from advertising executives to trailer tractor drivers. They presented a different vision of what women can do.

Do not swallow your tongue when a discussion of the need of mothering arises — discuss parenting instead. When the question of a lost male career arises, as it surely will, refuse to discuss that unless the discussion includes lost female careers as one and the same. Above all, refuse to discuss the effect of Golda Meir's career on her children unless the person is willing to discuss the effect of David Ben Gurion's career on his children — provided anyone even knows or cares if he had children.

It is no wonder that the family as presently constituted has survived so long. It is so much easier to have a predetermined decision as to who is going to be doing what. Who will give up what? And who, when all is said and done about women's liberation, will be the person who will be allowed to move and to grow and who will be expected to take off from work when a child is sick?

If we are really concerned about women in administration, then we will have to socialize women to the belief that they have a right to move and to grow and to play with the boys. And we will have to socialize men to be able to handle that concept both in their personal and their professional lives. As long as it is acceptable to put down girls as of no account, it will not be acceptable to work with them at equal or subordinate levels. If *she* is that terrible, then *he* must be worse if he works under her, or at least as bad if he works with her.

That attitude must be changed. Our administrative women don't train in graduate school; they train in kindergarten. Let us begin there.

References

Rossi, A.S. Women in science: Why so few. *Science*, 1965, **148**, 1196-1202.

Maccoby, E. Women's intellect. In S.M. Farber & P.H. Wilson (Eds.), *The potential of women*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963, 24-40.

Coser, R. & Rokoff, G. Women in the occupational world: Social disruption and conflict. *Social Problems*, 1971, **18**(9), 535-554.

4 Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies

ANDREW FISHEL AND JANICE POTTKER

Men, although a minority of the nation's teachers, have assumed the leadership of the nation's schools. The male domination of administrative positions is frequently justified on the grounds that men perform better as principals than do women and that teachers prefer working for male principals. Over the last twenty years a large number of studies have analyzed both the behavior of male and female principals and the differing attitudes of teachers towards principals of either sex. A review of this literature dramatically demonstrates the wide disparity between the popularly held beliefs regarding male and female principals and the empirical evidence regarding their behavior.

Underrepresentation of Women Administrators

Although two-thirds of American teachers are women, only 14% of school principals are female. While only 16% of elementary school teachers are males, men assume 80% of the principalships (NEA, 1973a). The percent of women elementary principals has sharply declined since 1928, as seen in Table 1.

Table I
Percent of Elementary School Principals Who Were Women.

Year	Percent Women Principals
1928	55
1948	41
1958	38
1968	22
1971	21
1973	20

Source: Johnson, 1971; NEA 1973a.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 110-117. Dr. Fishel is chief, Planning and Budgeting Branch, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., and Dr. Pottker is expert, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Educaton, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

In secondary schools, where women comprise half of the teachers, men constitute 97% of junior high principals and 99% of senior high principals. Women constitute only 12.5% of all assistant principals. Women comprise 31% of the assistant principals in elementary schools, 8% in junior high schools, and 6% in senior high schools (NEA, 1973a).

Behavioral Studies

Women clearly do not fare well in appointments to administrative positions. A popular rationalization for appointing men rather than women as principals is that men are supposedly better suited to be principals. Many studies over the past twenty years have compared various aspects of the behavior of men and women principals. The findings from these studies were reviewed in order to determine what, if any, empirical evidence exists to demonstrate that characteristics of successful principals are sex-linked. The most significant results are categorized according to four areas and are presented below: instructional supervision; relations with students; relations with parents and community; and general administration.

Instructional Supervision

1. Women principals are less tolerant of teachers acting on their own initiative and making their own decisions (Morsink, 1968).
2. Women principals emphasize and bring about a greater amount of productive behavior on the part of their teachers (Wiles and Grobman, 1955; Hines and Grobman, 1956; Morsink, 1968; Spence, 1971; Kobayashi, 1974).
3. Women principals influence teachers to use more desirable teaching practices (Hines and Grobman, 1956).
4. Women principals exhibit greater knowledge of teaching methods and techniques (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962).
5. Women principals are more concerned with the objectives of teaching (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962).
6. Women principals are more able and willing to assist beginning teachers with instructional problems (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962).
7. Women principals place greater emphasis on recognizing differences between individual pupils (Gross and Trask, 1965).
8. Women principals exhibit a greater concern for the social and emotional development of pupils (Gross and Trask, 1965).
9. There is no difference between male and female principals regarding emphasis placed on maintaining academic standards (Gross and Trask, 1965).
10. Women principals are more aware of potential problem students (Hoyle, 1969).
11. Women principals placed greater emphasis on evaluating the learning process taking place in their schools (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962).
12. The academic achievement of students in schools with women principals is either equal to (Hines and Grobman, 1956) or higher than

(Gross and Trask, 1965) the achievement of students in schools with male principals.

Relations with Students

1. There is higher student morale in schools having women principals (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

2. Women principals make greater efforts to involve students in school affairs (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962).

Relations with Parents and Community

1. Parents approve more often of the learning activities and outcomes in schools with women principals (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

2. Parents approve more often the way in which women principals handle student discipline (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

3. Parents look favorably upon schools with women principals more often than they do upon schools with men principals (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

4. Parents whose children are in schools having women principals are involved in school affairs as often as (Gross and Trask, 1965) or more often than (Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962) parents whose children are in schools with male principals.

5. Women principals are more often guided by community preferences when deciding on school operations (Mann, 1971).

General Administration

1. Women principals are generally more democratic in the way they operate their schools (Wiles and Grobman, 1955; Hines and Grobman, 1956; Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen, 1962; Morsink, 1968).

2. There is no difference between men and women principals in the amount of support given to teachers in conflict with a pupil (Gross and Trask, 1965).

3. There is no difference between men and women principals in the emphasis placed on maintaining school discipline (Gross and Trask, 1965).

4. Women principals display greater respect for the dignity of the teachers in their school (Wiles and Grobman, 1955).

5. Women principals have better and closer communication with teachers in their school (Wiles and Grobman, 1955).

6. Teacher morale in schools with women principals is either equal to (Gross and Trask, 1965; Kobayashi, 1974) or higher than (Hines and Grobman, 1956) in schools with male principals.

7. Women principals speak and act more often as representatives of the group (Morsink, 1968).

8. Women principals maintain a more closely knit organization (Morsink, 1968).

9. Women principals are more effective at resolving conflicts with staff members (Morsink, 1968).

10. Women principals are less rigid in their response to school situations (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

11. Women principals are better at reconciling conflicting demands (Van Meir, 1973).

12. Women principals exhibit greater foresight in the decisions they make and the actions they take (Morsink, 1968).

13. Women principals more frequently review the results of actions they have taken (Hoyle, 1969).

14. Women principals exercise stronger leadership (Van Meir, 1973).

15. Women principals generally exhibit more effective administrative techniques (Hines and Grobman, 1956).

These behavioral studies clearly indicate that in terms of ability to supervise and administer a school and to maintain good relations with students and parents, the few women who have been able to obtain administrative positions have performed as capably as, if not more capably than, their male counterparts.

Attitudinal Studies

Because behavioral studies have shown that women principals generally perform more capably than male principals, it is worthwhile to look at the results of studies made of the attitudes of teachers, administrators, and school board members toward women principals. These findings were reviewed and categorized according to three areas: Teacher attitudes toward women principals; attitudes toward the recruitment and hiring of women principals; attitudes of women principals toward their job. The major results from these studies are presented below.

Teacher Attitudes toward Women Principals

1. Male teachers prefer working for male administrators (Matheny, 1973; Neidig, 1973; NEA, 1973b; Linton, 1974).

2. Male teachers who have worked with a female administrator are more favorable toward women as principals than those male teachers who have not worked with a woman principal (Barter, 1959; Warwick, 1967; NEA, 1973b).

3. Women teachers are more favorable toward working with women administrators than are male teachers (Barter, 1959; Krause, 1964; Jenkins, 1966; Warwick, 1967; Lemon, 1968; Matheny, 1973; Timmons, 1973; Linton, 1974). (An opposite result was found by NEA, 1973b.)

4. Teachers believe there is no difference in the leadership abilities of men and women principals (Barter, 1959; Henschel, 1964; Cobbley, 1970; Longstreth, 1973; Linton, 1974). (An opposite result was found by Milanovich, 1966.)

Attitudes toward the Recruitment and Hiring of Women Principals

1. Colleges and universities make no special effort to recruit women for training to become principals (Warwick, 1967; Matheny, 1973; Peterson, 1973).

2. Women teachers receive less encouragement from supervisors to prepare for and to become administrators (Jenkins, 1966; Warwick, 1967; Taylor, 1971; Matheny, 1973).

3. There is strong bias against appointing women to administrative positions (Barter, 1959; Warwick, 1967; Cobbley, 1970; Taylor, 1971; Matheny,

1973; LaBarthe, 1973; Longstreth, 1973; Neidig, 1973). (Opposite results were found by Zimmerman, 1971; Holland, 1973.)

4. Women teachers do not aspire to administrative positions to the same extent that men aspire (Barter, 1959; Burns, 1964; Warwick, 1967; Zimmerman, 1971; Timmons, 1973; Peterson, 1973).

5. Women teachers do not academically prepare themselves for administrative positions as often as male teachers prepare themselves (Barter, 1959; Burns, 1964; Timmons, 1973).

6. Women teachers must possess superior qualifications and skills in order to be appointed to an administrative position (Warwick, 1967; Taylor, 1971; Matheny, 1973).

7. Most women who become administrators did not initially seek the position but rather were either offered the position or were encouraged by a supervisor to apply for it (Cobbley, 1970; Zimmerman, 1971; Scriven, 1973).

Attitudes of Women Principals toward Their Job

1. Women who become administrators do so because of the challenge it offers them and a desire to be in a leadership position (LaBarthe, 1973).

2. Women in administrative positions feel sensitive about holding a position traditionally held by men (LaBarthe, 1973).

3. Women who become principals express the same amount of satisfaction with their job as do male principals (Rock and Hemphill, 1966; Crosby, 1973).

It is frequently argued that the reason there are so few women in authority positions in the schools is not due to male bias, but rather that women teachers have not obtained the academic credentials necessary to hold administrative positions. While it is true, as these studies show, that women teachers do not aspire or prepare for administrative jobs to the same extent as male teachers, these attitudinal studies have also shown that women teachers are discouraged from seeking administrative appointments.

As a result of this discouragement, most women in education who seek positions other than that of a classroom teacher undertake graduate studies in fields other than school administration. This is illustrated by the small number of women who receive doctorates in educational administration as compared to other education areas. In 1972, only 11% of doctorates in educational administration went to women, as compared to 32% in educational psychology, 25% in counseling and 38% in curriculum (National Research Council, 1973). Similarly, from 1960 to 1969 only 13% of the doctorates in educational administration went to women as compared to 26% in educational psychology, and 21% in counseling (Council for University Women's Progress, 1971).

The results from these attitudinal studies indicate that there is prejudice shown by most male teachers, school superintendents and school board members against women serving as principals. As a result, the criteria currently used to recruit and hire principals is not related to characteristics needed for effective performance as principal. Sex has been the determinant in appointment to principalship, rather than ability. Although the weight of behavioral evidence indicates that, in many areas, the performance of

male principals is inferior to that of women principals, male teachers continue to receive the overwhelming number of appointments to administrative positions.

References

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration-where will they go from here? *Educational Horizons*, 1959, **37**, 72-75.

Burns, D.M. Women in educational administration: A study of leadership in California public schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1964, **25**, 2821-22A.

Cobbley, L. A study of attitudes and opportunities for women in six western states to become elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1970) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, **31**, 4409A.

Council for University Women's Progress at the University of Minnesota. *Proportion of doctorates earned by women, by area and field, 1960-1969*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1971.

Crosby, J.W. An exploratory study of women superintendents. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **34**, 3742A.

Gross, N. and Trask, A. *Men and women as elementary principals*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, 1965.

Hemphill, J., Griffiths, D., and Fredericksen, H. *Administrative performance and personality*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1962.

Henschel, B.J.S. A comparison of the personality variables of women administrators and women teachers in education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1964) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1965, **25**, 6313A.

Hines, V. and Grobman, H. The weaker sex is losing out. *School Board Journal*, 1956, **132**, 100, 102.

Holland, J.L. Relations between the chief school administrator's selection of principal candidates and the candidates' qualifications, attitudes on educational issues and sex. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **34**, 2213-14A.

Hoyle, J. Who should be principal — a man or a woman? *National Elementary Principal*, 1969, 23-24.

Jenkins, W.J. A study of the attitudes of elementary school teachers in selected schools in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania toward the women elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1966) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, **25**, 1223-24A.

Johnson, D. What is the future of women in school administration? In *Women: A significant national resource*. Washington, D.C.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1971, 35.

Kobayashi, K. A comparison of organizational climate of schools administered by female and male elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1974) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **35**, 129-30A.

Krause, J.L. A study of teacher attitudes toward their women secondary school principals in New Jersey. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1964) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1964, **25**, 967-68A.

LaBarthe, E.R. A study of the motivation of women in administrative and supervisory positions in selected unified school districts in Southern California. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **34**, 3695-96A.

Lemon, D.K. A study of the attitude of selected groups toward the employment of women for administrative positions in public schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1968) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1968, **29**, 1718-19A.

Linton, D.L. Teachers' perceptions of women as principals in an elementary school district. (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1974) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **35**, 1354A.

Longstreth, C.A. An analysis of the perceptions of the leadership behavior of male and female secondary school principals in Florida. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **34**, 2224-25A.

Mann, D. *Administrative-community-school relationships in New York state*. Report for the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1971.

Matheny, P.H.P. A study of the attitudes of selected male and female teachers, administrators and board of education presidents toward women in educational administrative positions. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **34**, 2976A.

Milanovich, A. Gentlemen before ladies? *New York State Education*, 1966, **54**, 18-19.

Morsink, H. Leader behavior of men and women secondary school principals. *Educational Horizons*, 1968-69, 69-74.

National Education Association. *26th biennial salary and staff survey of public school professional personnel 1972-73*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973(a).

National Education Association. Survey findings. *Research action notes — Resource center on sex roles in education*. 1973, **1**, 4(b).

National Research Council. *Summary report: 1972 doctoral recipients from United States universities*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, 1973.

Neidig, M.B. Women applicants for administrative positions: Attitudes held by administrators and school boards. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **34**, 2982-83A.

Peterson, M.T. Status and trends in the promotion of women to secondary school principalships with special reference to black women. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **33**, 6915A.

Rock, D. and Hemphill, J. *Report on the junior high school principalship*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1966.

Scriven, A.L. A study of women occupying administrative positions in the central office of large school districts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1973, **33**, 6920A.

Spence, B.A. Sex of teachers as a factor in their perception of selected leadership characteristics of male and female elementary school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1971) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, **32**, 2985A.

Taylor, S.S. The attitudes of superintendents and board of education members in Connecticut toward the employment and effectiveness of women as public school administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1971) In J. Pottker and A. Fishel (Eds.), *Sex bias in the schools: The research evidence*. Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975.

Timmons, J.E. A study of attitudes toward women school administrators and the aspirations of women teachers for administrative positions in the state of Indiana. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1973) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **34**, 4660A.

Van Meir, E.J. Leadership behavior of male and female elementary principals: A comparison by sex. *Marquette University Education Review*, 1973, **4**, 8-11.

Warwick, E.B. Attitudes toward women in administrative positions as related to curricular implementation and change. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967) *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, **28**, 1256-57A.

Wiles, K. and Grobman, H.G. Principals as leaders. *Nation's Schools*, 1955, **56**, 75-77.

Zimmerman, J.N. The status of women in educational administrative positions within the central offices of public schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1971) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, **32**, 1826A.

Additional Sources

Bard, J.F. Do women have second class status in education? *Pennsylvania Education*, 1971, 14-15.

Dale, C. Women are still missing persons in administrative and supervisory jobs. *Educational Leadership*, 1973, **31**, 123-127.

Fishel, A. and Pottker, J. Women in educational governance: A statistical portrait. *Educational Researcher*, 1974, **3**, 4-7.

Fishel, A. and Pottker, J. Women lose out: Is there sex discrimination in school administration? *Clearing House*, 1973, **47**, 387-391.

Lyon, C. and Saario, T. Women in public education: Sexual discrimination in promotions. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1973, **55**, 120-123.

Mickish, G. *Can women function as successfully as men in the role of elementary principal?* Boulder, Colo.: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Colorado, 1971.

Recruitment, Leadership and Training Institute. *Women in administrative positions in public education*. Philadelphia: Recruitment, Leadership and Training Institute, Temple University, 1974.

Saario, T., Jacklin, C., and Tittle, C. Sex role stereotyping in the public schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1973, **43**, 386-416.

Seawell, W. and Canady, R.L. Where have all the women gone? *National Elementary Principal*, 1974, **53**, 46-48.

Seltz, J. Woman teacher means second-class professional. *Teacher*, 1972, **90**, 44-45.

Sizemore, B.A. Will the woman administrator make a difference? Speech presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 1973.

Stiles, L.J. and Nystrand, P.M. The politics of sex in education. *The Educational Forum*, 1974, **38**, 431-440.

Taylor, S. Educational leadership: A male domain? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1973, **55**, 124-128.

5 Our Dwindling National Resource: Women School Administrators

LAURINE E. FITZGERALD

> *Wanted:*
> *Administrators for elementary, middle and secondary educational settings. Applicants must possess the minimum of the master's degree, and teaching experience. Additional desirable attributes include knowledge of curriculum design and contemporary teaching-learning practice, leadership skills and appropriate personality characteristics, experience in conflict resolution.* Must be female.

The above placement notice is ficticious.

The tragedy for our educational system is that similar notices flood school districts and placement offices, but the final sentence is omitted, and the implication is clear that a male administrator is sought. Four questions, among others, arise: Why? Who? When? and How?

Why More Women in Administrative Roles?

The need for more women in administrative roles has at least two well-documented reasons: The results as measured by student performance and involvement within the activities of the school, and the special administrative skills which result in improved teacher morale, and greater parental and community involvement in and approval of the educational programs. (See summation of "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies," Fishel & Pottker.)

Women are vanishing from the administrative leadership of the public schools. Although figures vary from area to area, it is clear that elementary teachers are predominantly women, but men are typically the principals; in middle and secondary schools, less than three in one hundred principals are women; women superintendents are too few in numbers, nationally, to be noted as a full percentage point. Within the slightly more than twenty-five years since World War II, the numbers of women who hold "full" administrative positions have eroded to a point of national and professional disgrace.

Dr. Fitzgerald is dean of the Graduate School and professor, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and director of the Northeast Wisconsin Regional Graduate Center of the UW System. She is president-elect of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

The recent trend of appointment of women to staff roles, such as assistant to, or the assistant or associate position which is a staff and not a line position does little to aid the credibility of equity or fairness within education.

In 1975 the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors reaffirmed the "Statement on Primary and Secondary Education for Girls and Their Mentors" (NAWDAC Task Force on Special Concerns K-12, April 1975) which noted the under-representation of women in administrative posts. This document was a revision of an earlier statement of concern which delineated a trend away from the appointments of women to positions of principals, assistant principals, associate or deputy superintendents, superintendents and assistant superintendents — a trend which followed a previous cycle of decline of women's participation in leadership roles and decision-making positions. Evidently, historians of education have overlooked the significant roles of women in earlier decades of this century; for example, Ella Flagg Young was superintendent of the Greater Metropolitan Chicago School District and also became the first woman president of the NEA in 1909.

Who Will Support Women Administrators?

In November of 1978 the American Association of School Administrators' Advisory Committee to "Survey and Design Training Models to Explore the Attitudes of School Board Members Toward Women in Educational Administration" was formed, and included a representative of the National Council of Administrative Women in Education (NCAWE). The Committee served in an advisory capacity to a project with the U.S. Office of Education to assist in the development and design of a model training program. Goals included the identification of attitudes and beliefs of school superintendents, other administrators and Board of Education members which might be barriers to the advancement of women into management positions in public education. Other goals were the development and testing of a model training program to explore the negative attitudes related to the advancement of women, and to disseminate the training packages developed through the grant with educational and noneducational professional associations. The work in this endeavor continues.

It would be a cumbersome task to list the research projects, and to detail the unsupported myths and beliefs about the obstacles for women in the assumption of leadership roles in public education. The literature is replete with miniscule, and large-scale projects which detail and refute personality characteristics of men and women which impart leadership in reverse order by gender, and with concepts which "might" make leadership roles difficult for women, such as softer voices, democratic group styles, and less assured postures. But, there also exists an increasing body of significant research data that indicate sex discrimination.

In a continually restricting economy, however, the most detrimental factor in the advancement of women may continue to be the mythology that a woman's employment is a "second income," and therefore of lesser importance. If the advancement of women is tied to marital status, and to dual earning power, then continued restrictions can be anticipated. In contrast to

previous decades of economic press, teacher unionization has equalized pay between the sexes and therefore the salary scale is attractive to single and married men and women. Previously, the salary sex differential factor was significant only in a negative sense that men would seek employment outside of education, leaving the remaining well-qualified females to advance.

When Should Women be Supported for Advancement?

NOW is none too soon. Discrimination which keeps women from promotion and advancement to appropriate management and leadership roles is explicitly illegal, and has been since 1972. However, the precise regulations and the implementation of expectations have not been available or enforced.

As the national population balance between men and women continues to shift in the direction of more women and the press of post-secondary education for more and more women in the part-time and full-time pool continues, there will be well-qualified and "over-qualified" women available for positions at all levels. Each year the percentage of women receiving the first graduate degree and the doctorate slowly moves upward within the total. What justification can there be for a tailing downward of women appointed to leadership roles in the public sector of education?

There appears to be no sound basis for the current practice of discrimination against women for leadership roles in elementary, middle and secondary education. If the practice of coeducation continues to exist at the post-secondary level, and it certainly appears that it will in most public institutions which have large and well-funded colleges of education, then the education provided to the individuals who participate in baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate programs should be equal. Why then should there be a differential in placement and in advancement?

A separate, but equally significant issue is the staffing configuration and the training and experience expected of the faculties for colleges of education or departments of teacher training in post-secondary institutions. Why are there so few women in singularly important areas such as Educational Psychology, Supervision and Administration, and Counselor Education? Who advises, guides, and serves as the role models for young women who may be seeking positions of leadership, influence, and power? At what point is a dramatic and major overhaul of the existing educational preparation system necessary?

How Should Women be Encouraged to Aspire for Administrative Positions?

The situation of women in educational leadership and administrative positions must no longer be considered declining, dwindling, or stable but *critical* for the educational well-being of the future for young people. Included within this future are the basic tenets of "preservation and transmission of knowledge," the "education of the whole person," and "the creation and dissemination of new information," all of which women are capable of doing and have done as research assistants while graduate students, as informal counselors while teaching at any level, and as teachers and administrators.

Most states have developed mandated courses which must be taken prior to teacher certification and which will assist the individual in assuming a teaching position without fixed, prejudicial postures towards race, and in some cases gender. However, a careful examination of the range of courses accepted for certification leads one to conclude that the centrality of concern is more with certification than with the dissemination of basic and important information. More important, a single course, however informative, represents only a gesture at problem resolution and impacts only those students completing a teacher certification program.

Beyond the very piecemeal approach of a "course for certification," attitudes of the faculty of post-secondary teacher-training institutions must be studied and, in many cases, changed. Textbooks should be re-examined on a yearly basis to insure gender-fair presentation of content materials, as well as racial equity. Additionally, methods of presentation and classroom behaviors of faculty should be evaluated within the context of gender-fair teaching. Content of the course may be over-shadowed by use of humor, supplemental materials, and the expressions of covert attitudes. In like manner, teachers in the public schools should consistently review texts, references, curricula and the internal procedures of governance for equity of use and practice.

The treatment of students in the public schools, especially in competitive activities such as publications, cheerleading, clubs and sports, should be monitored for "equal time" where appropriate, and fairness of elective or competitive practices.

Faculty women in the public schools can perform a special service for themselves and for the young women and men whose lives they influence. Every teacher is an alumna of a post-secondary institution, and as such can "make a difference." The annual fund drive contact should elicit a response, with or without a contribution, concerning the status of women on that specific campus; also, concerning program information and data about women's studies courses, women administrators, women in the tenure stream, academic and career advising for women in the nontraditional professions and counseling and advising in relation to teacher education and administrative graduate programs. One letter from every employed woman teacher would have tremendous impact upon post-secondary administrative decision-making!

Teachers can influence practices in their setting by requesting in-service courses which focus upon administrative skills and behaviors rather than solely upon content areas or methods and media innovations. "Budgeting techniques," "union contract negotiation," and "organizational communication" are but a few topics which might ignite the aspiration-inspiration syndrome in women who have not consciously thought about indicating an interest in administration within their school setting.

Finally, building a support network within a school building or system, for women, can be an effective beginning for initiating the emergence or re-emergence of women in leadership positions. Encouragement of a qualified woman to apply for a position in middle-management or administration frequently is the first experience for her which indicates that others recognize skills and qualities which she may not have identified. In many cases, after

an initial denial of interest, that individual will seek upward mobility by verbally indicating an interest in a future opportunity or by applying for the position currently available.

The practical and direct approaches necessary today to encourage women to seek and to assist them in retaining leadership positions may not be necessary in the future if there is re-education and redesign of existing subtle patterns of practice which discourage or do not encourage young women to utilize their talents in the educational enterprise. The paucity of women in positions of influence, power and leadership in elementary through high schools is a reflection of the neglect of one of our most valuable national resources and has resulted in the majority (in terms of numbers employed) serving in a minority capacity in the administration of education.

References and Resources

Gross, N. & Trask, A.E. *The sex factor and the management of schools*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1976.

Inequality in education, Sex discrimination. Center for Law and Education, Harvard University, Number Eighteen, October, 1974.

McLure, J. & McLure, G. The case of the vanishing woman: Implications for the preparation of women in educational administration, *UCEA Review*, 16(1), September, 1974.

Naiman, A. What to do about sex bias in the curriculum, *American Education*, April, 1977.

National Council of Administrative Women in Education, Arlington, Virginia. *Wanted more women.* Where are the women superintendents? *Wanted more women.* Why aren't women administering our schools? *Wanted more women.* Sex differentiation in public school administration.

Principal's *Bulletin*, A look at what's happening in the field and its impact on school supervision. Women superintendents: The stereotypes hold down the numbers. November, 1975.

Today's changing roles: An approach to non-sexist teaching. Teacher Resources with Curriculum Related Activities for Elementary, Intermediate, Secondary. Developed by Educational Challenges, Inc., Washington, D.C., for Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, National Foundation for the Improvement of Educational Challenges, Inc., Washington, D.C., for Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Washington, D.C., 1974.

6 Upward Job Mobility for Women in Elementary Education

JANE K. MACDONALD

Equal employment opportunity for women is currently a popular cause in which both advocates and adversaries can righteously defend their position. Advocates see themselves as stalwarts of equality and freedom, adversaries as the guardians of home and motherhood. The advocates at present have the law on their side since the right to equal opportunity in employment was created as federal law in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Among other things, Title VII specifically proscribed discrimination based on sex in the area of employment. Further assurances were granted to women in the field of education when Congress acted to pass Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments. Both laws serve as a viable mechanism for women to combat employment discrimination based on their sex.

Yet, statistics compiled in the 1970s continue to reflect inequities with respect to female employees. On the national level, 40% of all women work and hold approximately 40% of all the jobs but earn less than 60% as much as men do (Hall, 1973). In public education, 67% of all the teachers are women but less than 16% of them are administrators (Lyon and Saario, 1973). And, although 85% of all elementary school teachers are women, 79% of all elementary school principals are men (Levy and Stacey, 1973).

These statistics serve to reinforce the concept that legislation alone does not make equal opportunity for women a fact if the attitudes of society and women themselves remain unchanged. Despite the legislation and the significance of the movement for equal employment opportunity for women, too often the issue is not taken seriously. Both the stereotyped female and the male tend to view equality for women as unimportant, and perhaps harmful. They jointly concur that since the male is the protector and the female the protected, if the protected gains equal status she would lose more than she gains (Kreps, 1971).

The concept of the male as the protector and female as the protected has traditionally been presented in the socialization process of young children. The female child is encouraged to be dependent and the male independent

Dr. MacDonald is associate professor of mathematics at Miami-Dade Community College, South Campus, Miami, Florida.

(Bardwick, 1971). Since a positive correlation exists between degree of independency and strength of self-concept, and in turn between self-concept and achievement, the achievement levels of females are delimited by tradition (Berger, 1968). While there are obviously biological differences between the sexes, social customs are largely responsible for the behavioral sex differences (Hochschild, 1973).

The societal placement of a negative value upon the female sex-role stereotype was pointed out by a recent survey of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and social workers. The survey revealed that the characteristics used to describe an unhealthy, immature adult were found to be the descriptions of a normal female adult (Boverman, 1970). Women's acceptance of this negatively valued sex-role stereotype precipitates their possession of a relatively low self-concept which once again results in the retardation of their achievements (Boverman, 1970). Furthermore, the female sex-role stereotype lacks the traits generally ascribed to achievement, such as aggressiveness, so if women strive to achieve they must emulate the traits attributed to the male sex-role stereotype (Prather, 1971). Since achievement invites an unfeminine connotation, women tend to sacrifice their chances for personal recognition so as to be attractive to men (Horner, 1970). Hence the acceptance of the stereotype sex-role constrictions results not only in a failure for most women to aspire but also, for those daring to aspire, a fear of success (Horner, 1969). Women who have achieved have been found to possess a positive self-concept in addition to a perception of the feminine role which incorporates both passive and active traits in contrast to that of the passive female sex-role stereotype (Frankel, 1974).

One logical starting place to attempt to expand the horizons of women in their own future potential is the school. For better or worse, the schools, elementary and secondary, have always been supportive of the status quo. The curriculum, textbooks, policies, practices, vocabulary, and teacher attitudes all smack of sexism and reinforce the existing attitudes toward male and female roles. Of these factors the most influential force in the educational process is the teacher, especially on the elementary level. This fact points to the need to study the perceptions of women elementary classroom teachers with respect to upward job mobility for women. Women teachers, as products of a sexist society, may well face a personal conflict in supporting a more positive feminine self-concept in the young females they teach (Bradwick, 1971). Since women educators serve as role models for youth, their perceptions of upward job mobility for women in the field of elementary education have implications more far reaching than for just increasing the numbers of women in educational administrative positions in the near future.

Many reasons have been set forth to explain the phenomenon that in the field of elementary education where the preponderance of elementary school teachers are women the majority of leadership positions are still held by men. One such reason is that women in the field do not seek administrative posts due to a conflict of interests between their career and family roles. Another reason espoused is that women do not compete for leadership positions because they feel men are preferred in these roles. Testing the validity

of these reasons was the purpose of a study conducted in the Dade County, Florida, school system (MacDonald, 1975).

The first aspect of the study was to survey women in the positions of elementary classroom teacher, assistant principal, and principal to identify their perceptions of: (1) the interrelationship between career and family roles of women, (2) the attitudes of central office hiring personnel toward the sex of an elementary school principal, (3) teacher attitudes toward the sex of an elementary school principal, and (4) community attitudes toward the sex of an elementary school principal.

The second aspect of the study was to compare the perceptions of the three groups of women educators. The comparison of perceptions by role groups was formulated based upon the supposition that women do not occupy administrative positions because they do not apply for such positions. If a woman educator's perceptions of the career/family interrelation and sex discrimination in the field are decisive factors as to whether or not she will apply for an administrative position, then the perceptions of those women who have applied might be expected to differ from the perceptions of those who have not applied.

For the purpose of identifying the perceptions of the three role groups of women educators, the following four questions were posed:

1. Do the women feel that the career and family roles of women are compatible?

2. Do the women feel that central office hiring personnel are impartial with respect to the sex of an applicant when hiring elementary school principals?

3. Do the women feel teacher attitudes are impartial with respect to the sex of an elementary school principal?

4. Do the women feel community attitudes are impartial with respect to the sex of an elementary school principal?

For the purpose of comparing the perceptions of the three groups of women educators, the following four hypotheses were formulated:

1. There are no differences at the .05 level of significance among the women elementary classroom teachers, assistant principals, and principals with respect to their perceptions of the interrelationship between the career role and family role of women.

2. There are no differences at the .05 level of significance among the women elementary classroom teachers, assistant principals, and principals with respect to their perceptions of central office hiring personnel attitudes toward the sex of an elementary principal.

3. There are no differences at the .05 level of significance among the women elementary classroom teachers, assistant principals and principals with respect to their perceptions of teachers' attitudes toward the sex of an elementary principal.

4. There are no differences at the .05 level of significance among the women elementary classroom teachers, assistant principals, and principals with respect to their perceptions of community attitudes toward the sex of an elementary principal.

A sample of women elementary school classroom teachers, assistant principals, and principals was selected from the Dade County Public School

System in Florida. An attitude inventory containing four subscales relative to the four dimensions of the study, and a background data sheet designed to obtain career, family, age and race information were mailed to the women educators. The returned data were computer processed and multivariate analysis techniques were employed to test the hypotheses.

All three role groups of women indicated that they felt the career and family roles of women were compatible, but the strength of each group's conviction was weak. The teacher and assistant principal groups were uncertain about the impartiality of the central office hiring personnel toward the sex of an applicant for an elementary school principalship, while the principal group weakly endorsed the concept. The three groups of women educators indicated uncertainty about both teachers and community impartiality toward the sex of an elementary school principal. There were no significant differences among the role groups of women with respect to their measured perceptions and hence the four hypotheses were accepted.

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The interrelationship between the career and family roles of women is not a significant factor accounting for the under representation of women in administrative positions in the field of elementary education.

This conclusion appears to contradict the widely held assumption that women do not seek leadership roles in the labor force in general due to a conflict between their home and job responsibilities. The most likely explanation may be that the employment hours and days required of a professional, teacher or administrator, in the field of elementary education do not generally encroach upon the most relevant times for a mother to meet the needs of her family. In addition, the scheduling of preparatory educational course work for upward job mobility in the profession is relatively convenient for a woman with family responsibilities.

2. Perceived sex discrimination toward a person occupying a leadership role in the field of elementary education is not a significant factor accounting for the underrepresentation of women in administrative positions in the field of elementary education.

This conclusion contradicts another widely held assumption that women do not seek leadership roles because they feel men are preferred in such positions. Perhaps this contradiction is due to the traditional concept of the field of elementary education as a female occupational domain.

Whatever the explanation for the conclusions, the bottom line is that women are underrepresented in leadership positions proportionate to their numbers in the field of elementary education and the reasons for this underrepresentation are not (1) that they do not seek such positions due to a family and career conflict, and (2) that they do not seek such positions due to a feeling that men are preferred in such positions by the community, the teachers, and central office hiring personnel.

The question remains: Why are women elementary educators underrepresented in leadership roles?

References

Bardwick, J.M. *Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts.* New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Berger, C.R. Sex differences related to self-esteem factor structure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1968, **32**(4), 442-446.

Boverman, I.K., Boverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, **34**, 1-7.

Frankel, P.M., Sex-role attitudes and the development of achievement need in women. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, March, 1974, **15**(2), 114-119.

Hall, G. Changing roles in the labor force. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1973, 135-137.

Hochschild, A.R. A review of sex-role research. In J. Huber (Ed.), Changing women in a changing society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Horner, M.S. Fail: Bright Women. *Psychology Today*, November, 1969, 33-34; 36-41.

Horner, M.S. The motive to avoid success and changing aspirations of college women. *Women on campus: 1970 a symposium.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1970.

Kreps, J.M. *Sex in the marketplace: American women at work.* Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins Press, 1971.

Levy, B., & Stacey, J. Sexism in the elementary school: A backward and forward look. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1973, 105-199.

Lyon, C.D., & Saario, T.M. Women in public education: Sexual discrimination in promotions. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1973, 120-123.

MacDonald, J.K. *Upward job mobility for women in elementary education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1975.

Prather, J. Why can't women be more like men: A summary of the socio-psychological factors hindering women's advancement in the professions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1971, 172-182.

7 Sexual Discrimination in School Administration Opportunities

EDWARD J. VAN MEIR

Much is being written today on the changing role of the female in our society. Much of what has been stated about sexual discrimination in business, politics, the home and in employment can also be applied to education and job opportunities at the higher administrative levels in education.

That the percentage of women in administrative leadership posts during the past four decades has steadily declined is evident and easily documented. In 1928, according to a National Association of Elementary School Principals research report (Thirty-Seventh Yearbook, 1958), 55% of the elementary principalships were held by women. By 1958, this percentage had dropped to 41%, and by 1968 the figure had decreased to 22%.

The same trend is also noted at the high school administrative level. The National Council of Administrative Women in Education (1965) indicates that in the eleven-year period between 1950-51 and 1961-62 the number of women serving as junior high and senior high school principals dropped from 18% to 3.8% for all secondary schools. National Education Association data show that for this same eleven year period the percentages of women elementary principals decreased by nearly 20% (Taylor, 1966). The story is essentially the same for women directors and supervisors in the public schools. The percentage of women in such positions dropped from 50.1 to 43.4 between 1950 and 1955 (Taylor, 1966), and the numbers have continued to decrease.

What reasons then are given to explain this underutilization of female resources? Although there are a number of reasons projected, the reiteration that female administrators are incompetent cannot be supported by evidence. However, let us first consider a number of other proposed reasons and return later to the incompetence issue.

One frequently stated reason is that most women lack the appropriate graduate education to qualify for the principalship. Findings tend to support this position. Data show that women are not, in general, preparing themselves for administrative positions in education. In 1962, less than 16% of women teachers had two college degrees, whereas 40% of men teachers held

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Summer, 1975), pp. 163-167. Dr. Van Meir is superintendent of schools, Elmhurst, Illinois.

two degrees. Men hold four doctoral degrees in education to every one held by women (Taylor, 1966).

National Education Association data (December, 1963) indicate that 37.1% of men teachers hold master's degrees or higher, compared to 18.5% of women teachers. Since most states require a master's degree or a five-year college program as a minimum requirement for certification as an elementary principal, a smaller number of the women teachers meet the minimum educational requirements.

Also, there is evidence that women are not earning administrative credentials at the same rate as men. Figures from the United States Office of Education indicate that a greater percentage of women are receiving master's degrees (34.7% in 1967 as compared to 29.2% in 1950); however, they are not receiving them in administration, supervision and finance. Of the 7,230 degrees earned in 1969 in these areas, 22.2% were conferred to women and 77.8% to men (Koontz, 1969).

Other frequently stated reasons as to why women do not secure administrative positions include: (1) few women desire to leave teaching for administration; (2) women often lack the career tenure to qualify; and (4) they lack the financial incentive to seek the responsibility.

Examination of some of these statements suggests some validity. The old story that women teachers are not motivated and do not want to be, or are not in a position to be, administrators appears to have some truth. Barter (1959) found that 46% of men elementary teachers expressed an interest in becoming an elementary school principal, whereas only 7.8% of women elementary teachers expressed this same interest.

Another reason behind women's failure to achieve administrative positions is that they are more transitory. An NEA study shows that 45.2% of men teachers have been teaching in only one school system. In contrast, 30.9% of women teachers have been with only one system. Since school districts tend to give preference to teachers with tenure when filling administrative positions, men have an advantage (Taylor, 1966).

Career interruptions also account in part for the lack of women appointees to educational administrative posts. The teaching careers of women show a large record of leaves and temporary retirements. Two-thirds of the married women teachers, the NEA reveals, have taken at least one extended absence from teaching.

The most common hypotheses are that men are better suited to educational administration and that there are basic differences between the sexes in administrative ability.

That boards of education and superintendents appear to favor the employment of male principals, not only for high schools but also at the elementary level, is indicated by figures from the Department of Elementary School Principals. While men constituted only 7% of the elementary school teacher staff in 1958, they accounted for 59% of the elementary principalships.

Some school superintendents interviewed in a study by Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958) indicated a bias in favor of females for the elementary principalship, stating it was simply common sense that women principals give more professional leadership than do men. In comparison with men,

woman principals typically are more experienced as elementary teachers, they know a great deal more about elementary education, and they know how to handle more effectively problems confronting young children. In addition, these superintendents charged men elementary principals with being so interested in moving up the administrative ladder that they tend to neglect the professional leadership facet of their relationships with teachers.

Those superintendents with a bias toward the male elementary principal felt men to be less emotional than women and usually more practical. They believed men provided more professional leadership and that women teachers preferred to work with male principals (Gross, 1958).

Interestingly, a survey completed in 1967 of 1,186 elementary school principals in the state of Illinois found that 56% felt that sex was not a major factor in the employment of a principal in their school system. A higher percentage of women (70%) than men (53%) believed this to be true. Of the respondents who felt that sex was a factor in the selection of principals in their system, 90% believed that men were given preference (Merigis, 1967).

What does research, then, have to indicate on the time honored view that men are better suited for leadership and to educational administration than women? Much study has been undertaken in this area. A review of a few of these findings clearly indicates little if any support for this view.

A recent study of eighty women in leadership positions in North Carolina (Norman, 1970) from 1967-69 was undertaken to explore the characteristics of women leaders and to relate and compare these characteristics to male leaders. Results of the personality questionnaire indicated that the women leaders participating in the study were more intelligent, more abstract in their thinking, and had higher scholastic capacity than 91.8% of the general population. The findings prompted the author to comment:

> A composite picture of women leaders in North Carolina pictures these women as women of high intelligence, confident, self-assured, sufficient, resourceful, temperamentally independent, uninhibited, able to face wear and tear without fatigue, socially precise, with a strong self-image, imaginative, self-motivated, creative, shrewd, calculating with an intellectual approach to the situation. These women leaders are high in ability to initiate structure in an organization, and are considerate, taking into account regard for well-being and status and contributions of followers, scope of initiative, decision and action. They can tolerate uncertainty and postponement and can reconcile conflicting demands and maintain cordial relations with superiors.

Perhaps the most comprehensive study of the administrative behavior of elementary principals was the "Determination of the Criteria of Success of School Administration Project" (Hemphill, 1962). This study made it possible to compare the administrative performances of 137 men and 95 women principals on a wide variety of factors. The study provided information to allow comparison of 137 different variables on a sex difference basis. An interesting finding of this study was that, when performance was evaluated by superiors and by teachers, it was found that both groups were somewhat negative toward men principals and generally positive toward women principals.

Though the results of the above investigation appear to slightly favor the female participants, it does not present evidence that a woman principal

should be preferred over the man who may also be a candidate. It does indicate, however, that as a class men are not overwhelmingly superior to women as elementary school principals. The authors of the project, in considering the question, "Should men be appointed as elementary school principals in preference to women?" concluded that the answer was "probably not."

Another extensive and intensive research study into leadership behavior by sex was the National Principalship study in 1959 (Gross, 1965). The 175 elementary principals participating in this phase of the study were part of a national sample of all elementary and secondary school principals in American cities of a population of 50,000 or more. Important to the findings of this investigation is that administrative "effectiveness," as defined by the study, has no apparent relationship to sex.

A Michigan study of secondary school principals to determine if, and to what extent, men and women secondary school principals behave differently as leaders led to the following conclusion: "Although few specific conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study as to the superiority of men or women in displaying leadership behavior, there is nothing to suggest any valid reasons for not employing women as secondary school principals" (Morsink, 1970).

A similar study to investigate the suitability of men and women for leadership positions conducted among elementary school principals in Illinois provided a similar summary comment:

> Leader behavior of female and male elementary principals as perceived by teachers, provides little evidence as to the superiority or inferiority of one group over the other. And although the two groups appear more equal than unequal, the evidence tends to favor the behavior of the female group.
>
> Thus, it would appear the selection of candidates for elementary administrative positions should be based upon the qualities, attributes and abilities of the individual without regard to sex (Van Meir, 1971).

In studies carried out at the University of Florida (Grobman, 1956) over a six-year period on the behavior of elementary school principals, women as a group exceeded men as a group in measures of an effective elementary school principal. The study found the "democratic" behavior was more characteristic of women, with teachers expressing greater satisfaction with the human relations which existed in schools administered by democratic rather than by undemocratic principals.

It would appear that there is little if any significant evidence to support the notion that males are better suited for leadership and educational administration than females. In fact, a number of research studies appear to provide some support for the opposite viewpoint.

It would seem somewhat apparent, then, that the factor of sexual discrimination has played an important role and has been evidenced over a period of time in the selection of candidates for administrative positions. This is apparently an unjustified bias, a bias which will be difficult to correct until the social and cultural expectations of women are modified and an increasingly larger number of women seek administrative credentials and positions. Complicated by the realization that over the past years women

have been discouraged and forced out of the administrative job market, the bias is also likely to continue. Until these factors can be modified, the decreasing trend in the number of female administrators is likely to continue toward the point of zero population.

References

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration. *Education Digest*, 1959, **25**, 72-75.

Department of Elementary School Principals. *The elementary school principal* Thirty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958.

Grobman, H. & Hines, U.A. What makes a good principal? *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 1956, **40**, 5-16.

Gross, N. & Herriott, R.E. *Staff leadership in public schools: A sociological inquiry*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Gross, N., Mason, W.S., & McEachern, A.W., *Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Hemphill, J.K., Griffiths, D.E. & Frederiksen, N. *Administrative performance and personality*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Koontz, E.D. *1969 Handbook of women workers*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Merigis, H.J. & Gill, D.G. *The elementary principal in Illinois: A status study*. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 1967.

Morsink, H.M. Leader behavior of men and women principals. *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 1970, **54**, 80-87.

National Council of Administrative Women in Education. *Wanted — more women in educational leadership*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.

National Education Association, Research Division. Estimates of school statistics, 1963-64. *Research report 1963 — R12*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, December, 1963.

Norman, B. A study of women in leadership positions in North Carolina. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 1970, **36**, 10-14.

Taylor, H.A. Women in administration. In M.C. Nolte (Ed.), *An introduction to school administration*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Van Meir, E.J. *Leadership behavior of male and female elementary principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1971.

8 Wonderland and Looking-Glass: Women in Administration

ELEANOR M. SCHETLIN

Women in administration, like men in administration, need administrative skills: planning, organizing, staffing, scheduling, coordinating, directing, supervising, reporting, budgeting. It helps if they develop skills in areas such as interpersonal relations, group dynamics, leadership, organizational theory, communication, negotiation, management, and how to be a change agent. Prepared with appropriate skills however, competent women administrators are lucky if they work with competent, prepared, and rational men administrators. Instead, women are more likely to disappear down the Rabbit-Hole or behind the Looking-Glass, like Alice, into an administrative world of unreason in which prescribed sex roles, myth, stereotype, and unexamined assumptions predominate.

Like Alice, women in administration have first to find the Rabbit-Hole or to get through the Looking-Glass since, as Fley (1974) points out, "The cavalier manner in which some selection committees and employers view women applicants and strive for rationale and means to circumvent equal opportunity employment requirements deserves to be called what it is — discrimination." Once in administration, women often find that as they move on cue around a Mad Hatter's Tea-Table, the Hatter is the only one to get any advantage from the change. Some, behind the Looking-Glass, concede to the unreason and become Red Queens, skimming, "Now, *here*, you see, it takes all the running *you* can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!" (Carroll). These women imagine that advancement will come if only women work harder. Some, in Wonderland, concede to the unreason and become White Queens, continually quarreling with the other players in a mad croquet game, shouting, "Off with his head!" or "Off with her head!" (Carroll). These women imagine that if only they show "masculine" qualities, women can gain "equality" with men.

Few of us, however, want "equality" with either men or women if it means conceding to unreason and joining in a Wonderland/Looking-Glass world. I do not aspire personally, for instance, to "equality" with those men

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 104-109. Dr. Schetlin is director of student services, Health Science Center, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

and women I have met in administration who are intellectually limited; irrational; hysterical; unprepared; unmotivated; incompetent; bewildered; unskilled; disorganized; irresponsible; unfeeling or unthinking. Rather, we need equity so that competent women and men can work together to create more functional institutions, and men cannot and need not become, solely because of their sex, Hatters administering Mad Tea Parties or lunatic games, while administrative women become Red or White Queens.

As Cook points out (1971), "Comparatively little has been written about the role of the male, but all writers agree that the adult male seeks and finds his identity primarily through his work and secondarily through his family." This role prescription for the adult male seems to me to be one of the major problems. Perhaps some men, like some women, should be in the home, managing the household and children; or some men, like some women, should be employed outside the home only in simple or supportive jobs because this is all the capacity they have or wish to use. Instead, our myths insist that our men should function outside the home; they place men, and often unprepared men, in responsible positions because of a purported general competence, intelligence and rationality; they make men maintain positions, or shift into new ones, as part of a caste system that operates to the detriment of men and women of all ethnic groups (Cook, 1971).

Thus we now may need to move to research on the roles and capacities of men rather than women. The problems, needs, roles and activities of women are being delineated for and by women nation-wide (Gager, 1974), and sexism in education is under constant legal attack (Levy, 1974). Educational institutions are still resistive to women, however, and educational administrators, both men and women, are still functioning largely in terms of myths and stereotypes.

To stimulate research both on our societal caste system and on our destructive myths about sex roles and capacities, perhaps the best answer any administrator can give to the proposition, "It's a man's world," is, "Yes; and *look* at it." Our society is beset with problems that include war, violence, poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, crime, delinquency, pollution, overpopulation, depletion of natural resources, waste of human resources, unequal distribution of the world's wealth, drug abuse, ecological damage, flood and mining disasters, urban decay, suburban sprawl, farm inequities, unemployment, inflation, job dislocation, skill obsolescence, energy crises, racism, sexism, youthism, age-ism, alienation, inhumanity, injustice, destruction of wildlife, vanishing species, devastation of wilderness areas, dying oceans, crowded courts, unequal civil rights, ineffective law enforcement, inequitable legal representation, inadequate schools, continuing ghettoes, and major problems in such areas as traffic and accident control, mass transportation, rape prevention, safety standards, consumer protection, health care, food and drug inspection, social welfare, prisons, juvenile homes, mental illness, mental retardation, family planning, and criminal and physical rehabilitation.

On the evidence provided by our societal problems, it seems hardly reasonable to conclude that men as administrators have produced a rational world and functional institutions. Rather, it seems sensible to insist that those who believe in societal leadership for men must come to recognize

both the depth and the extent of our societal problems and the failure of men, as a caste, to solve or prevent the problems. Men as a caste, given a few thousand years more of societal pre-eminence, may do better; but it seems clear that the competent among our men need all the help that competent women can give them. Thus, we need to seek "equity" for both men and women, rather than "equality" for women with men. We need to convince our reasonable and competent men that the caste system is unproductive, and that they are themselves burdened by the incompetence of those who should not be in the positions they hold. If we can do this, perhaps the Wonderland/Looking-Glass myths and sterotypes will end, and men and women with competence can bring some order into our present chaotic "man's world."

In seeking equity, however, we need to remember that we are faced with, not reasoned conclusions based on research, but expected role behaviors, outdated role models, prejudices, biases, and unexamined assumptions.

Most women are in the Wonderland/Looking-Glass world of Alice, who tried to apply reason to all sorts of situations no more bizarre than those faced by Everywoman, and perhaps particularly by women administrators. After all, most women administrators on occasion have been, like Alice, the sole woman in a meeting with a March Hare, a Dormouse, and a Mad Hatter; have been able to introduce as little sense as Alice could; have found the meeting about as productive as the Mad Tea-Party; and may well have agreed with Alice, "It's the stupidest tea-party I ever was at in all my life!" (Carroll). Most of us have been expected on occasion to work at jobs or for pay that would be an insult to a man; have spoken sense to quite ordinary men who ignored us; been treated by incompetent men administrators (and clerks) as if we were serfs; been excluded from necessary information by an administrative "Boys Club" playing at "Secrets"; been expected to take minutes at meetings with men; been suspected of hysteria, power plays, and egocentricity because of behaviour that would be considered reasonable from a man; and watched men indulge in hysteria, power plays, and egocentricity that other men accepted as quite "rational" behavior.

Perhaps men (and women) do not perceive hysteria, irrationality, or incompetence in men. If not, why not? If so, what maintains the myth (have we proven it a myth?) that men are the rational, objective, competent sex? Is this myth the reason for a "cavalier manner" toward women applicants? In administrative situations, can we identify any mechanisms that maintain this and other myths?

As a woman administrator among men, many of my experiences seem to reflect what I call the Big Daddy/Little Woman Syndrome. This informal designation means to me the maintenance in a work situation outside the home of family role models that may be appropriate in the home but inappropriate outside it. The Syndrome thus represents the administrative expectation that every income-earning woman should be supportive to, and provide nurturance for, every income-earning man. It seems to me, that is, that men and women are "playing house" in their paid work situations, acting out caricatures of stereotyped husband and wife, daddy and mommy roles. Thus, women administrators seem to be enmeshed not only in the societal stereotypes of "masculine" leadership, what men and women

should be like, "man's work" and "woman's work, "but in the additional stereotypes of the Big Daddy /Little Woman Syndrome.

For instance, in a unit composed of ten women headed by one man, I heard nothing about any difficulties he might have working with so many women. When I later headed the same unit, the sole man on my staff, working with seven women, was asked, "How do you stand working with all those women?" Was the comment prompted by the Big Daddy/Little Woman Syndrome? Did the first instance seem "natural" since the man was being "nurtured" by "all those women" as Big Daddy should be?

I suspect the Big Daddy/Little Woman Syndrome was present at least three other times in my Wonderland/Looking-Glass experiences. In each case, I received responsibility formerly held by a man in a complex, disorganized area. Each time, after I had transformed the area into a functional unit, another man was appointed or re-assigned as a general administrator to supervise the area. Each time, I was complimented for successfully handling the area and urged to continue the good work. The new administrator did not either intervene or contribute in any way, but received all future credit as "head" of the functional unit I had created and was maintaining, as well as a fancier title, higher pay, and sole access to the top administrator.

I speculate that these experiences were indeed examples of the Big Daddy/Little Woman Syndrome: my fellow administrators simply felt more comfortable when the Little Woman was playing a "nurturant," supportive role to a Big Daddy. If so, my experiences might also be examples of what I call the Boys' Ploy, which also makes men feel more comfortable. The Boys' Ploy is my informal name for the selective use of evidence to support the bias that men are somehow superior to women. Users of the Boys' Ploy derogate, forget, or re-define as less valuable that which is accomplished by a woman; or credit a man with the woman's success; or redefine the successful woman as a non-woman. Thus the area in which women have been successful may be devalued, as, for instance, the home, nursing, child care and elementary school teaching. The woman herself may be devalued and her performance conveniently forgotten: thus such high-level administrative women of the past as Boadicea of Britain, Cleopatra of Egypt, Eleanor of Aquitaine, Catherine the Great of Russia, Christina of Sweden, Isabella of Spain, Judith, Queen of the Falashas or Black Jews, and the women administrators who left their names to the Elizabethan Age and the Victorian Era have been all but deleted from the history books or pictured, incorrectly, as ineffective Little Women who were the pawns of men. The woman's performance may be obviously successful but summarily devalued, as Ms. King's tennis defeat of Mr. Riggs is devalued with the remark, "She tired him," even though the evidence is that Ms. King won the first point, game, and set, when Mr. Riggs was supposedly still chipper, and thus simply outplayed him. Women of competence may in fact be redefined as "men," since they are perceived as having "masculine" traits; thus, physically able girls become "tomboys," and a good woman driver drives "like a man." Even professionally successful women may define themselves as non-women, considering themselves "as 'special,' — i.e., extraordinarily intelligent, hardworking, stubborn, competent — not like other women" (Howell, 1974). Thus evidence of the success of women

outside the home is rationalized away, so that in contradiction to repeated evidence, the competence of women outside the home can be continually denied. This denial perpetuates the myth that only men make good administrators and that all is "natural" in the administrative world only when Big Daddy supervises the supportive Little Woman.

Since it is unlikely that almost every high-level position in the country requires the stereotyped "masculine" qualities, it is probably a symptom of the Syndrome that only a small number of women currently hold high-level administrative positions, while far larger numbers of women are supportive associates, assistants, secretaries. Many institutions might in fact save considerable sums by dispensing with high-level and minimally productive men, abolishing the positions supportive to them, and giving the high-level title and salary instead to those supportive women who are already doing the work. Sandler (1972) wrote, "What women are asking for is essentially the jobs that men now hold." If women indeed hope to replace less competent men, we need to realize, as Truex (1971) proposes, that "NOW is the time to make common cause with all women . . . ."

I suggest that women who earn money as administrators might join forces with other equally skilled women administrators: women who as volunteers administer cultural, environmental, community service and consumer affairs groups and women who as homemakers are fine administrators within the home. Our volunteer and homemaking administrators are often as competent as their paid counterparts in the skills and areas listed in the first paragraph above.

I suggest further that a re-examination of the "centrality of a woman's being a mother and wife" (Cook, 1971) might be stimulated by proposing, because of the insistence on the centrality of that role, that women should be running the government. I suggest this because, while the stereotypes about sex roles remain, the functions of government have changed.

The functions of government are now primarily those that within the home are considered to be women's work, among them: feeding the hungry, managing the budget, caring for the sick and aged, planning for the children's schooling, socializing the young, maintaining order, controling noise, refereeing disputes, providing transportation, maintaining peer and diplomatic relationships, keeping peace with the neighbors, monitoring cleanliness, preventing disease and accidents, promoting health and safety, disposing of wastes, maintaining sanitation, occupying the unemployed, preserving resources, cleaning up, and beautifying the environment. It may be, for instance, that we are engulfed in pollution because there are no women in government to tell the men to take out the trash.

Shirley Chisholm told the NAWDAC 1972 national conference that women are needed in government to establish new priorities. Could it be that woman's natural, supposedly biologically-determined, role as nuturer and homemaker is to run our national homeland? Logically, in terms of the stereotypes, women should be running the government.

To summarize, I propose that we try to deal rationally with irrationality: undertake research on the roles and capacities of men; try to identify in administrative situations the mechanisms through which sex role myths are maintained; recognize that both experiential and research evidence may be

summarily dismissed; find ways to join in common cause with both competent men and unpaid women administrators; and seek to revise stereotypes by applying them in unexpected ways. In spite of the Wonderland/Looking-Glass administrative experiences of many women, we should encourage women to become administrators and perhaps particularly in educational institutions, since these should be the most active in educating the young to appreciate the best capacities of all our societal groups.

References

Carroll, L. *Alice's adventures in wonderland. Through the looking-glass. The hunting of the snark.* New York: Modern Library, no date.

Cook, B. Roles, labels, stereotypes: A counselor's challenge. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1971, **34**(3), 99-105.

Fley, J. The time to be properly vicious. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1974, **37**(2), 53-58.

Gager, N. (Ed.) *Women's rights almanac* 1974. Bethesda, Md.: Elizabeth Cady Stanton Publishing Co., 1974.

Howell, M.C. Professional women and the feminist movement. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1974, **37**(2), 84-87.

Levy, L. (Ed.) *Inequality in education: Sex discrimination.* Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Law and Education, Harvard University, no. 18, October 1974.

Sandler, B. What women really want on the campus. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 24, 1972, 8.

Truex, D. Education of women, the student personnel profession, and the new feminism. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1971, **35**(1), 13-20.

9 Roadblocks to Women's Careers in Educational Administration

GREGORY C. COFFIN and RUTH B. EKSTROM

Women hold only 12.7% of public school principalships and less than 1% of school superintendencies.

A recent review of the research on women in educational administration (Goerss, 1977) has provided information about the personal, educational, professional, and psychological characteristics of this group. These studies report the age of women administrators as ranging between 45 and 60; at all levels women administrators seem to be older than their counterparts. Many women administrators are married and have children. The majority of women administrators hold doctoral degrees. Most women administrators begin their careers as teachers. Many women administrators are employed in central office positions, often in recently created jobs.

Although sex stereotypes have created a myth that women lack the emotional stability and personality to hold leadership positions, the review by Goerss showed that these stereotypes are not substantiated by research. This has also been substantiated by a review of the motivation, personality, and work-related characteristics of women in other male-dominated professions (Ashburn, 1977). However, there is some evidence to suggest that women in such professions have less ambition and lower commitment to their jobs than do men.

This research is based on an informal survey, conducted in 1976, of 64 women school administrators. The purpose of the survey was to determine the validity of the theories that women do not have high aspirations for careers as school administrators. We hypothesized that this purported lack of ambition is, instead, a response to the roadblocks which these women have encountered in their careers. These roadblocks are, in turn, based on misinformation which creates a belief that women do not have the training and experience necessary for administrative positions, and on sex role stereotypes.

Dr. Coffin is professor of education and director of Urban Schools Collaborative, Northeastern University, and Dr. Ekstrom is research scientist, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.

Questionnaire Respondents

Because our survey was intentionally informal, those sent questionnaires were not chosen by any sampling technique but were women administrators known to the authors, or women who had registered with the American Association of School Administrators. Ninety questionnaires were mailed out and 64 replies (71%) were received. Not every respondent completed all parts of the questionnaire, and several, instead of or in addition to answering questions, sent letters describing their experiences.

The women in the sample were employed in 20 different states and the District of Columbia, with the largest number from Massachusetts (20%), Florida (9%), Illinois (8%), and Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York (each with 6%). Other states with more than one respondent were California, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. The women ranged in age from their late twenties to early sixties. The majority who reported their age were in their thirties (38%) and forties (43%), with the modal age forty-two; 27% did not give their age.

Marital status can have considerable effect upon a woman's advancement in educational administration, a career in which the ability to relocate at strategic points may be critical. The majority of our sample were married.Of those giving information on marital status, 56% were married, 25% were single, and 18% were divorced.

Child care, especially when young children are involved, can place heavy additional burdens on working women. This is especially true for divorced women, who often do not have another adult to share such responsibilities. Most of the women who were or had been married had children (74% of those married; 80% of those divorced). The number of children ranged from one to six, with the average slightly above two (2.13). Divorced women had slightly larger families, averaging 2.375 children; married women averaged 2.043. Sixty-eight percent of those responding to our survey had at least one school-age child, but only 6% had preschool-age children.

Almost all the women held one or more advanced degrees. Of the 62 who gave information about education, 50% held the doctorate, 11% a post-master's specialist degree or certificate, 35% the master's, and 3% the bachelor's as their highest degree at the time of our survey. Several of those holding master's degrees were enrolled in doctoral programs.

Our respondents fill a wide range of administrative positions in local and state educational agencies, in higher education, and in federal and state government. More than two-thirds (69%) are employed by local education agencies (LEA's). These include three superintendents, seven assistant or associate superintendents, twelve principals, two assistant principals, and nineteen others in administrative positions (such as directors of staff development, research, curriculum or instruction, program coordinators, and other central office staff). Another 18% are employed in higher education, as faculty or administrators.

Results

Aspirations. Do women want to become educational administrators? A number of studies (Barter, 1959; Burns, 1964; Peterson, 1973; Timmons,

1973; Warwick, 1967; Zimmerman, 1971) have found that women teachers do not aspire to administrative positions to the same degree as do men teachers. Moreover, the literature shows that women who have become administrators often did not independently seek out these positions but were encouraged by others to apply for them (Cobbley, 1970; Scriven, 1973; Zimmerman, 1971). However, comparative studies of women and men teachers indicate that the women received less encouragement to prepare for and to seek administrative jobs (Jenkins, 1966; Matheny, 1973; Taylor, 1975; Warwick, 1967). Thus, the failure of women to aspire to such posts may result from a lack of encouragement.

The women in our survey already hold administrative positions. We wanted to see if they were satisfied to remain in their present jobs or if they longed for other posts with increased responsibilites. Each respondent was asked to state the next position she would like to achieve as well as her ultimate professional ambition. Stating a specific job for both questions (as opposed to a generalization about doing something else) can be considered to be an indication of goal orientation because it implies both an understanding of opportunities for and routes to advancement and a knowledge of the structure of the educational administration hierarchy.

In response to both questions, when specific positions were noted, superintendencies were most frequently named, particularly by those employed in LEA's. Several women employed in higher education aimed at college presidencies. A number of respondents indicated that educational consulting of some type was their ultimate professional aspiration.

With regard to the next position to which they aspire, 61% named a specific one (such as superintendent or principal); 26% had a nonspecific goal ("other adminstrative experiences," "some position with equal pay and recognition"); and 13% did not state any immediate job ambition. Specific aspirations were more frequent among women with Ph.D.'s than among those with master's degrees; the latter were more likely to have nonspecific goals. These differences approach but do not achieve statistical significance (probability of $X^2 = 0.20$). Women in their thirties and forties more often reported specific professional ambitions than women over fifty. These age differences are statistically significant (probability of $X^2 = 0.05$). The observed relation between age and lack of professional goals may indicate that the women over fifty have encountered so much professional rejection in the past that their ambition has been extinguished.

The data on ultimate professional aspirations are similar to those for the desired next positions. Far fewer respondents had an ultimate professional goal, however. Only 42% specified particular positions as eventual goals; 40% had nonspecific goals, and 18% had none. Women employed in LEA's were more likely to have specific ultimate goals; those employed in other educational settings, such as SEA's, higher education, or the federal government, were more likely to have nonspecific goals (X^2 probability $= 0.10$). Ultimate goals apparently are unrelated to degrees held. There is more of a tendency for women in their forties to have specific professional goals and for women over fifty to report no such ultimate aspirations, but this difference, unlike that regarding immediate goals, does not reach or even approach statistical significance.

Experience. Each respondent was asked to list the types of positions for which she had been an active candidate since acquiring her current credentials, to indicate the hiring authority, and to state whether or not she was interviewed for the job. The mean number of applications was 1.43 (S.D.=1.50). Nearly half of the women responding (42%) reported they had never applied unsuccessfully for a position. Unfortunately, we cannot tell whether they were always successful in their applications or whether they simply did not apply. Fourteen percent of the respondents had been unsuccessful in one application, 16% unsuccessful in two, 13% in three, and 14% unsuccessful in four or more applications.

The data suggest that women with doctorates more often were unsuccessful in four or more applications (22%) than women without such degrees (6%). However, the relation of unsuccessful applications to degree held does not reach statistical significance (X^2 probability =0.20). The data also suggest that the number of unsuccessful applications is somewhat related to age, with the younger women and those over fifty more apt to report no unsuccessful applications, while women in their forties were more likely to report four or more unsuccessful applications (however, this relationship was not statistically significant). Women with specific ultimate aspirations are much more likely to have applied for jobs more often; those with nonspecific or no eventual aspirations were significantly less likely to have made many applications (X^2 probability =0.05). This finding supports our interpretation of the specificity of aspirations being an indicator of goal orientation.

The mean number of interviews was 1.48 (S.D.=1.09), only slightly higher than the mean number of applications. Despite this, many of the respondents included negative statements about interviews, often feeling apparently that the interview was granted only because the hiring authority sought to comply with Affirmative Action regulations. One woman stated: "I have been interviewed only three times out of about twenty-five applications and in each of these cases I had unmistakable indications that it was a token interview to satisfy some demand to interview a woman." Another wrote: "From May of 1975 through June of 1976 I applied for 102 line and staff positions at the assistant superintendent and superintendent level. I was given *two* interviews and neither job was really open; I was the 'fly-in' affirmative action candidate, willing to locate anywhere." Still another said: "At the superintendent level the districts just seem to be doing their affirmative action thing which is to have black applicants and women as applicants in the kitty."

Perceived Roadblocks. The respondents were asked, with regard to unsuccessful applications, what they considered the key roadblocks. The most frequent reasons given were: sex discrimination (18%); predetermined appointees (17%); predetermined attitudes of hiring authority (15%); lack of appropriate experience (12%); racism (10%); and age (10%). For many women several of these roadblocks were operative.

Statements about sex discrimination and preconceived attitudes about women included being told that women were not hired as principals in a school system because of "custom"; that women are not aggressive enough negotiators to direct staff relations; that men do not want to take direction

from a woman; and that the community was not ready for a woman administrator.

The note added to the questionnaire by a Title I supervisor with more than twenty years of teaching experience, who has made three unsuccessful applications for a principalship, may be typical. "Silly as it seems, the fact that I was a woman seemed to be the biggest obstacle. My training is as good as many men. My track record in school positions is good. I was told by a university advisory not to get my administrative credentials if I wished to remain in this community and use them. The situation is gradually changing with a new superintendent who sees women as people." One woman thought the reasons she had been denied a position were "predetermined attitude (really 'shock') of having a woman in such a position, plus predetermined appointees." Another commented: "The basic roadblock comes in that most upper and middle management positions are held by white males and few white males want to report to or be told by a black woman what to do or how to do it, no matter how super qualified she may be." Another noted: "The key roadblock was the fact that, in most cases, literally hundreds of qualified white, married male candidates with experience in similar positions were too sure a thing to turn down."

The double liability of age and sex was a particular problem. A twenty-nine year old woman felt she was deemed inappropriate by the hiring committee because she was too young and inexperienced a female to deal with rough children. "I do always feel that I must earn my credibility, that my competence is not assumed by those who don't know me largely because I am young and female. Men my age are often *assumed* to be administrators-in-the-making and are requested to apply for administrative positions." Women over fifty also believe their age militates against them. One of these (age 51) commented: "I feel that the public is not ready to consider a woman seriously and boards are sensitive to that. I must objectively note, however, that I am past 50, which is a 'magic' age for superintendency applicants, and this may have entered into it." A woman of fifty-three wrote: "I seldom apply for jobs as recent experience tells me that age is a barrier."

The combination of sex discrimination and race discrimination was commented on by several respondents. For example, "I am a black female and I feel that the factors that have contributed to my unsuccessful efforts to secure promotion and upgrading of salary have been sex and race discrimination. Most of the top administration jobs in this system are filled by white males. There is a policy on fair and equal employment; however, inequities do still exist." "Blacks don't get jobs until whites have messed up the system totally and the courts or expediency requires change," said a woman who had been told by one suburban district that they were not ready for "colored" teachers, and by another that they did not hire "outsiders."

Several wrote that geographical limitations caused by marriage and family made it much more difficult for them to get specific types of positions necessary to move up the educational administration ladder. An assistant superintendent felt "the most difficult hurdle for a woman is appointment to a secondary principalship." One woman said: "Never in a million years can you imagine the frustration. I am well qualified and have had a very successful experience base. Elementary principalships are open but I aspire to

become a high school principal and superintendent." Another commented: "I want to enunciate for you my own personal advocacy for the right of women in educational administration to enter the specialized world of central office administration without being first or finally relegated to a position of elementary school principal."

Role of the Hiring Authority. It was obvious that many hiring authorities often were only "going through the motions" when they interviewed women. Many respondents mentioned predetermined candidates. Others described how attitudes of hiring authorities (frequently school boards or school committees) played a major role in limiting the hiring of women for administrative positions. Such boards not only held attitudes which resulted in age, race, and sex discrimination, but they also indicated a lack of knowledge on the board members' part about educational administration One woman said: "School committees are an enigma — too often uninformed; they don't like kids or teachers or seem excited about learning." Another, now teaching educational administration in a university, believed there often was noticeable uneasiness in the interviews when she applied for central administration jobs in LEA's; this she attributed to "interviewers often being inferior in knowledge and experience to the interviewee." A former superintendent, now working in the Civil Rights field, commented that state associations of school boards hold extensive power over people and education. She quoted an officer of one such associa on as saying, in a case involving sex discrimination, that he could "show the board how to do whatever it wanted, legal or illegal, and how to get by with it." Another woman cynically wrote: "The most successful way to get a job is to have someone on the inside who has clout (power, power) and is pulling for you." And another: "Boards go on personal recommendations or reputations of well-known people in their area." One young black woman stated that, although she had been successful in her applications, the age, sex, and ethnicity of interview committees could be major roadblocks. "Being black, young, and female made each employment opportunity a major uphill fight and made me a very lonely person. This, however, has made me just that much more adamant about being successful."

Is There a Key to Success? Despite the obstacles the women who answered our questionnaire experienced, many have managed to achieve considerable professional success. We asked them to describe factors which might have contributed to their success. It was obvious from the wide variety of responses that no single factor opens the door to success for women in school adminstration. The two most often cited were good credentials and hard work, mentioned respectively by 10% and 8% of the respondents.

The success factors reported can be grouped roughly into three categories: personal traits, mentioned by 60%; situational factors, 20%; and experience, also 20%. The personal traits listed included abilities and qualities of temperament. Hard work was first; general competence, adequate health, stamina, and vigor, and human relations (interpersonal) skills tied as the next three most frequently mentioned abilities; persistence placed fifth. Other traits included: positive attitude, assertiveness (without "turning off"

too many people); acceptance of parents and students; ability to communicate on the community level; "chutzpah"; commitment to education; concern for how young people learn; determination; effective use of time; flexibility; follow-through; refusal to allow being a woman (pregnancy, young child, family responsibilities) to interfere with job performance; decision-maker skills; being structured and organized; public relations skill; being well-informed; willingness to work (both harder than males in comparable positions and beyond "the call of duty"); willingness to listen; willingness to resign if not promoted; and willingness to attend to career opportunities as they become available and to go where they are.

The situational factor most often considered helpful to success was contacts through professional relations in general, as well as with males able to provide entree. This was followed by making immediate use of every possible opportunity and being in the right place at the right time; good luck; a mate who encouraged professional growth; ability to devote weekends and evenings to work tasks; encouragement from men in the field; opportunity to build a professional reputation; and opportunity to be visible and to produce.

The possession of good credentials was considered the most important experience factor. Involvement in community affairs and other meaningful organizations (such as political and professional groups) ranked second, followed by appropriate experience, and a good professional reputation.

The success of women in the field of school administration seems the result of a process in which factors such as "luck" or "being in the right place at the right time" are as important as experience. This same process accounts for many of the roadblocks women administrators encounter — sex discrimination, race discrimination, age discrimination, and insincere hiring authorities (who have already decided who will be given a certain job, or whose minds are closed to the competency and experience of women).

Discussion

Our findings are, in general, in agreement with what has been reported by others. For example, in terms of personal characteristics and educational background, the women responding to our survey are similar in age, marital status, and education to most other samples of women administrators (Goerss, 1977). This suggests that, although this was an informal sample, there may be some basis for believing that it is fairly representative of women administrators as a group.

The main factors which we found to be roadblocks to the hiring of women administrators, discrimination and attitudes of both the women and the hiring authority about "appropriate" roles for women, have also been reported elsewhere (Clement, diBella, Ekstrom, and Tobias, 1977; Estler, 1975; Fishel and Pottker, 1975; Goerss, 1977; Howard, 1975; Schmuck, 1975). Both Estler and Schmuck view the problem of the low proportion of women in school administration as having two underlying causes: (1) discrimination, and (2) low aspirations and ideas about "women's place."

Certainly the reports of the women in our sample confirm the existence of discrimination in the hiring of school administrators. The evidence suggests that the hiring authorities hold the kinds of prejudicial attitudes and beliefs

about women administrators described by Fishel and Pottker (1975) and that they are not aware of the behavior evidence, reported by these authors, which "clearly indicates that in terms of ability to supervise and administer a school and to maintain good relations with students and parents, the few women who have been able to obtain administrative positions have performed as capably as, if not more capably than, their male counterparts."

However, we cannot view discrimination, low aspirations, and attitudes about women's roles as being distinct entities. All of these stem from the sex-role stereotyping which is pervasive in our culture. It results in socialization which produces women who have limited aspirations and difficulty in dealing with role ambiguity and conflict. This socialization also produces men who hold inaccurate attitudes and expectations about women's competencies.

There is not a single, simple solution to the problem of women in educational administration. Affirmative action laws and Title IX have helped to end open and overt discrimination. But covert discrimination, fed by these inappropriate sex-role stereotypes, remains. Programs are needed to help women who might wish to become school administrators overcome the effects of the sex-role stereotyping that was a part of their socialization and education. Multifaceted programs for those who train and who hire school administrators are also needed if these individuals are to become able to recognize and deal with their own attitudes about and expectations for women.

Several women in our survey admitted that they had not applied for administrative openings, but waited to be asked. As one said: "I've been programmed not to apply for positions that were perceived as being 'jobs for males.' I have been asked to assume each administrative responsibility because of my previous performance." This finding is in keeping with other research which indicates that women do not seek out administrative positions as actively as men do. When this fact is combined with the fact that women receive less encouragement to apply for administrative positions than do men, it is not surprising that few apply.

Those women who did apply were confronted by further obstacles to success. We agree with the woman who wrote: "One's professional life ought not to be solely a series of struggles against prejudice and discrimination."

Summary

Sixty-four women who hold positions in educational administration completed questionnaires describing themselves, their professional aspirations, their experience in seeking employment as administrators, the roadblocks they believe limit their careers, and the factors that have contributed to their success.

The typical respondent is married, aged forty-two, with two children. Almost all hold one or more advanced degrees; 50% have doctorates. Two-thirds are employed in LEA's as superintendents, assistant or associate superintendents, principals, assistant principals, or in other central office administrative positions.

Sixty-one percent have specific immediate professional goals and 42% have specific ultimate professional goals. Specificity of goal was significantly more frequent among women employed in LEA's than among those employed in other settings.

Nearly half of the respondents have never been an unsuccessful applicant for an administrative position. Women with specific ultimate goals were significantly more likely to have made more unspecific or no ultimate professional goals.

Sex discrimination, predetermined appointments, and negative attitudes of the hiring authorities were the major roadblocks reports. These interacted with age and race discrimination. Personal traits such as hard work, competence, good health, vigor and stamina, interpersonal and human relations skills, and persistence were identified as major factors leading to success.

References

Ashburn, E.A. Motivation, personality, and work-related characteristics of women in male-dominated professions. *Ruth Strang Award Monograph Series No. 2.* Washington, D.C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1977.

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration. *Educational Horizons*, 1959, **37**, 72-75.

Clement, J.P., diBella, C.M., Ekstrom, R.B., & Tobias, S. No room at the top? *American Education*, 1977, **13**(5), 20-23, 26.

Cobbley, I. A study of attitudes and opportunities for women in six western states to become elementary school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1971, **31**, 4409A.

Estler, S.E. Women as leaders in public education. *Signs*, 1975, **1**(2), 363-386.

Fishel, A., & Pottker, J. Performance of women principals: A review of behavioral and attitudinal studies. *Journal of NAWDAC*, 1975, 110-117.

Goerss, K. Women administrators in education: A review of research 1960-1976. *Ruth Strang Award Monograph Series No. 3.* Washington, D.C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1977.

Howard, S. *Why aren't women administering our schools?* Arlington, Virginia: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975.

Jenkins, J.W. A study of the attitudes of elementary school teachers in selected schools in Montgomery Co., Pennsylvania, toward women elementary school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1966). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, **25**, 1223-24A.

Matheny, P. A study of the attitudes of selected male and female teachers, administrators, and board of education presidents toward women in educational administrative positions (Doctoral dissertation, Northwest University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1973, **34**, 2976A.

Peterson, M.T. Status and trends in the promotion of women to secondary school principalships (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1973, **33**, 6915A.

Schmuck, P.A. Deterrents to women's careers in school management. *Sex Roles*, 1975, **1**(4), 339-353.

Scriven, A.L. A study of women occupying administrative positions in the central office of large school districts (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1973, **33**, 6920A.

Taylor, S.S. The attitudes of superintendents and board of education members in Connecticut toward the employment and effectiveness of women as public school administrators. In J. Pottker & A. Fishel (Eds.), *Sex bias in the schools.* Teaneck, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975.

Timmons, J.E. A study of attitudes toward women school administrators and the aspirations of women teachers for administrative positions in the State of Indiana (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1974, **34**, 4660A.

Warwick, F.B. Attitudes toward women in administrative positions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1967, **28**, 1256-57A.

Zimmerman, J.N. The status of women in educational administrative positions within the central offices of public schools (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1971, **32**, 1826A.

10 Women in Higher Education Administration

NANCY PEKIN CUMMINGS

Cohen and March (1974) reported that in 1970 only 11% of college presidents in the United States were women and over 90% of these women were presidents of Roman Catholic women's schools. The Carnegie Commission (1973) found that women "are so rarely represented in top academic administrative positions as to be practically nonexistent in the upper echelons." Despite a few notable exceptions, the situation has not changed in recent years. An obvious reason for the lack of top female academic administrators is the fact that top administrators traditionally have come to their positions from top ranking faculty jobs, and women are almost as scarce here as they are in administrative positions. The Carnegie Commission (1973) found that the percentage of faculty members who were women holding full professorial rank at four-year colleges and universities in 1972 was only 8.6%. "It is obvious," observes Marythea Grebner (1977) "that the pool of qualified women must be expanded."

Efforts to expand the pool, however, must take into consideration the factors which account for the smallness of the pool in the first place. That is, before asking how we can get more women into academic positions, we must have some understanding of why there are not more women in academic positions right now. That outright discrimination is a factor has been amply documented (Abramson, 1975). But discrimination alone, particularly in today's more open attitude toward the women's movement, does not account for the lack of women in academic positions. As a matter of fact, women administrators do not particularly see themselves as having experienced discrimination against women (Cochran, 1978). Nevertheless, discrimination is a factor and must be taken into account in attempts to expand the pool.

Psychological and sociological factors must be taken into consideration, too. Patricia Faunce (1977) points out how patterns of female socialization to acceptance of non-leadership roles and the double-standard tend to discourage women from pursuing academic careers. There are also social myths about women in the work world that stand in the way of women's occupational success; in particular, we have the myth that women's managerial styles are inept, shrill, and emotional. And there is the fact that, for

Ms. Cummings is a teaching fellow in the department of philosophy, College of Education, at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.

whatever reasons, women have been excluded from what Max Weber termed "charismatic education"— i.e., the education of persons selected to fill leadership roles, including the grooming of the young professional after his or her period of formal training. Like discrimination, these factors must be taken into consideration, too, in attempts to expand the pool of qualified women.

Arlie Hochschild suggests a third factor which cools women out of the quest for top-level academic positions; namely, that the academic career is founded on assumptions about family ties that fit men (at the present time) rather than women (Hochschild, 1975). These assumptions include the expectation that time out for child-bearing will not occur; that home situations will be completely supportive of and flexible to job moves, long hours, career socializing, and the like; that career preparation will take place in the shortest amount of time possible; and that child and home care will be handled by someone else in the family (not the employee). These factors, too, must be taken into consideration in attempts to expand the pool.

Combating Discrimination

In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued an executive order for affirmative action in order to combat discrimination by federal contractors against minorities. Since 1968, all educational institutions with federal contracts over $10,000 have been prohibited from discriminating in employment on the basis of sex. In addition, since 1973, all educational institutions, public and private, receiving $50,000 or more in federal contracts or grant funds, have been required by the federal government to have affirmative action plans, including numerical goals and timetables. Institutions in violation are subject to delay of pending government contracts and/or ineligibility for future contracts. Guidelines provided by the government in October, 1972, emphasize that affirmative action goes beyond nondiscrimination in that it involves "deliberate and positive efforts on the part of institutions to rectify existing inequities that result from past discrimination" (Carnegie Commission, 1973).

There has been much criticism of affirmative action. One particular criticism is that it results in "reverse" discrimination and lowered standards of academic excellence. The Supreme Court's recent Bakke decision, which invalidates rigid quota systems, did not rule out considerations of race and sex entirely as selection criteria; therefore the fear of reverse discrimination persists, as does the fear that preferential treatment will lower standards. However, some of this fear is due to "erroneous interpretation of legal mandates" (Webb and McCarthy, 1978). What misinterpreters fail to understand is that federal guidelines for affirmative action do not require universities to employ or promote anyone who is unqualified. In 1974, Peter E. Holmes, then director of HEW's Office for Civil Rights, sent a memorandum to the heads of 2,800 institutions reminding them that it is the colleges and universities, not the federal government, that determine what constitutes qualification for any particular position (Solomon and Heeter, 1977).

But affirmative action has been questioned from another point of view; charges have been made that it simply is not working — i.e., that affirmative

action is not resulting in either the hiring or the upgrading of more women. Carol Van Alstyne (1977) reports that despite "years of verbal commitment to affirmative action, relatively few women . . . hold top jobs in higher education administration." Her findings, which were based on the 1975-76 biennial survey of administrative compensation conducted by the College and University Personnel Association, indicated that at white coeducational institutions white men still dominated the top level administrative posts, holding 96% of the chief executive positions and over 80% of all other types of administrative positions covered in the survey. Further, women administrators tended to be concentrated in a smaller group of jobs than men (head librarians, nursing deans, affirmative action/equal employment officers, etc.) and to be paid lower salaries than men for equivalent jobs. Alstyne finds this latter fact interesting in view of the claims that the small number of women at the top can be accounted for by the scarcity of women in the pool. She reasons that if this claim were true, then women at the top would be making more money since they would be in greater demand. Further, white institutions pay minority men they hire about as much as they pay white men, but white women are paid only about 80% of what men are paid for equivalent jobs. Apparently, scarcity increases the salaries of minority men but not of white women. Minority women do slightly better than white women, but they are also behind both white and minority men in terms of salaries.

Jane Loeb (1978) differs slightly with Alstyne, citing additional studies of faculty employment which indicate affirmative action programs "have apparently somewhat eased women's access to academic employment, especially at universities," but she does call attention to a study by Dorfman and Cell which found a decrease of nearly 1% in the percentage of college faculty positions held by women between 1974-75 and 1975-76, and she agrees that salaries still lag behind, even when performance variables (years since highest degree, publications, etc.) have been accounted for. As a matter of fact, she maintains that "the present study documents the failure of an approved affirmative action program to decrease the residual salary difference that exists between men and women." Further, affirmative action programs have been very expensive to administer; the University of California system estimates expenditures of $3,000,000 for 1974-75 alone. Loeb concludes that "concerning federally required affirmative action programs for women in their present form, it seems fair to conclude that the cost to institutions has far exceeded the benefit to the protected group."

At any rate, gains for women through affirmative action show no signs of solving the problem. The Carnegie Commission (1973) estimates that to reach an average percentage of women in the professoriate of 30% by 1990, it would be necessary to maintain a constant proportion of women among new hires of 50% and not even the most ambitious affirmative action plan can promise this. Further, according to Marythea Grebner (1977), government enforcement of affirmative action programs cannot be counted on for immediate action since the federal government, with all its overloaded attempts to enforce opportunities, is too swamped to be effective.

Psychological and Social Barriers

As the seventies draw to a close, the contemporary phase of the women's liberation movement seems to have achieved some level of success. While society still operates on basic sexist premises, advances have been made in many areas. Men are shown diapering babies on TV commercials and your telephone repair person just might be a woman. In this general climate, the psychological and social barriers to full participation in society faced by women are gradually eroding. Much remains to be done, however, in terms of recruiting women students into college. Providing financial aid and appropriate support services for them once they get there such as counseling, consciousness raising, assertiveness training, etc. and encouraging women to enter careers in higher education are examples. Nevertheless, individual (psychological) liberation seems inevitable. But the social structure persists and the personally liberated woman must still find ways to combat it if she is to succeed in typically male dominated fields like higher education administration.

Leaders in the women's movement have not been unresponsive to these changes. While the early days of the movement concentrated on such techniques as individual consciousness raising, today the emphasis has moved to what might be described as corporate survival skills. Typical of these efforts have been those engaged in by Project HERS (Higher Education Resource Services), activities of which include workshops and seminars specifically for academic women who want to move up the administrative ladder. Dr. Cynthia Secor, director of the Mid-Atlantic regional office of HERS, described the objectives of these workshops at the National Women's Conference in Houston in November of 1977 (Cummings, 1977). The focus is on overcoming the barriers that women face when it comes to advancing in the job hierarchy in higher education. She emphasized the need for women to understand the patterns of management and control that exist in their own institutions — e.g., knowing who makes policy, who implements it, who makes decisions, what are the long-range plans of the institution, what is the budget, and how is it put together. She also stressed the need for women to develop general management skills, to learn about accounting, budgeting, and administrative leadership skills. She also emphasized the need for women to come to understand the male paradigms that shape work relations; e.g., football and military metaphors, to prepare themselves for the common expectation that they will have to be better than a man to get a man's job, and to learn to take credit for the work they do, to become "visible" and assertive. She warned against going to meetings without "doing your homework," suggesting that the usually lone woman at the meeting needs to be even more informed that any of the men because she is likely to be singled out for "the woman's point of view." Her motto regarding meetings was: "If you don't know, don't go!" She stressed the need for women to learn about the use of channels of information within the institution and without, including informal channels.

In this latter regard, she talked about "networking," which is also described by Sheila Tobias, Wesleyan Associate Provost and founder of the Committee for the Concerns of Women in New England Colleges and

Universities, in a recent issue of *Change* (June/July, 1978) as "a response to the phenomenon that the top jobs are handled behind the scenes." "Networking" involves consciously associating oneself with other women for mutual support, the developing of mentoring relationships between women, getting to know other women administrators, and sharing information regarding job openings.

Of obvious value in preparing women for positions of academic leadership is participation in those training programs designed specifically to prepare both men and women for such positions. Degree programs in higher education administration can play an important part in preparing women, as well as men, for leadership roles. For women, and men, who cannot take leaves to participate in such degree granting programs, colleges and universities can be encouraged to develop and institute their own administrative training programs, including internships, for their own faculty and lower echelon administrators. The Dallas Community College District has reported its apparently successful attempt to institute such a program (Rippey & LeCroy, 1978) and El Paso Community College has recently begun such a program in response to a proposal made to the president of the college by the EPCC Women's Coalition (a group of concerned women faculty, students, and support staff) in the spring of 1978 (Cummings, 1978). These latter programs are too young to be adequately evaluated in terms of their effectiveness for women. One highly-motivated and qualified woman initially involved in the El Paso project dropped out after her summer internship, reporting frustration with the administrative bureaucracy and a feeling that "it just wasn't worth all the time and energy required." Other women have reported dissatisfaction with higher status men's jobs, too (Faunce, 1977).

Redefining the Job

Unfortunately, it seems that while psychological support systems and training for administrative positions have helped equalize opportunities for women, they are not enough. According to HERS, the organization most intimately involved in these areas, the least successful aspect of their work has been actually placing women in administrative jobs. And, as has been suggested, there are highly qualified women who are either not attracted to such positions or are disillusioned by them when they get them. Arlie Hochschild (1975) suggests that academic careers are based on assumptions inherently inimical to women in today's world. Hochschild's observations appear to be borne out by the dramatic rise of women aspirants to Law school in the last few years (from 6.5% of LSAT registrants in 1966-67 to 13.3% in 1970-71, and the perception by women of Law as a suitable professional field for a woman (Lavine, 1974). Women find Law attractive because they see it as a field which (1) *fuses* aggressive and helping humanitarian traits (thus mitigating social disapproval of feminine aggressive behavior); (2) provides more flexibility in hours than other professional fields; (3) provides more opportunities for part-time practice; (4) has more job mobility; and (5) requires less career single-mindedness. These perceptions do not accord with the realities of legal practice, but they are significant in that

they indicate the kinds of job characteristics that women find attractive. Not much concern has been paid to this kind of information except as it has been used as "evidence" that women are not interested in leadership positions.

Most of the attempts to help women succeed have been attempts to get women to change their minds about the kinds of jobs they find attractive. Efforts like those of HERS, for example, can be seen as efforts to "resocialize" women to the demands of the male work place. These efforts can meet with only limited success as long as women are expected to fulfill the roles that women traditionally fill in our society. That is, as long as women are expected and want to be wives and mothers, they will find typical male-defined leadership roles uncomfortable and overly demanding. What is needed, according to Hochschild, is a redefinition of academic jobs in ways that will make them more open and attractive to women. This view receives some support from the Carnegie Commission (1973), too, which suggests some of the following ways to redefine academic jobs: (1) Part-time positions should be re-evaluated and awarded fringe benefits. Hochschild suggests part-timers be put on the tenure track as well. (2) Anti-nepotism rules should be abolished. (3) Maternity and parental leave for both sexes for child-rearing should be granted. Hochschild goes farther, but is less optimistic than the Carnegie Commission. She believes that unless women want to give up marriage and family, or can find househusbands, or choose to hire full-time substitute wife-mothers, or can find men who are willing to give up family life, only one long-range solution is apparent: "the possibility of an egalitarian marriage with a radically different career to go with it. This means creating a different system in which to work at this different career, a system that would make egalitarian marriage normal" (Faunce, 1977). Unfortunately, she also believes that "we cannot change the role of women in universities without changing the career system based on competition, and we can't change that competition structure without also altering the economy, the larger fit of supply and demand of workers."

Such large solutions to the problems of academic women on the move may ultimately be required. Unfortunately, to look for solutions in some future "revolution" is scant hope for women today. Nevertheless, anything near equal representation at top levels will not be attained as long as women have to adjust themselves to job patterns that contradict accepted social patterns. Difficult as it may be, both job patterns and social patterns will have to change. The social patterns involved here have to do with the structure of the family, a structure which serves an essential and humanizing role in society. Changes in the family should not be toward less involvement on the part of the female spouse, but toward greater involvement on the part of both spouses. Unfortunately, changes in the family must be accompanied by changes in job structures and there are very few signs that job structures in the realm of academic administration are going to be changed to suit the needs, not of women, but of the family, anytime soon. And what a pity! For Hochschild is right when she suggests that the problems women face in academia are not just "women's problems," but everyone's problems, including the university's. In a world of growing complexity, the human race can no longer afford to ignore half its potential. The current pressures

toward women's full participation in society experienced and produced by both women and right-thinking men are signs that society is recognizing its need. But if Hochschild's analysis is correct and the only solution lies in a total restructuring of the economy, we are in for a long wait. In the meantime, women and men must continue to make "room at the top" for those exceptional women who care enough to confront society's expectations.

References

Abramson, J. *The invisible woman: Discrimination in the academic profession*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Pub., 1975.

Carnegie Commission. *Opportunities for women in higher education*. McGraw Hill, 1973.

Cochran, J. How do women administrators view job satisfaction and discrimination? *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans Administrators, and Counselors*, Winter 1978, **41**(2), 67-68.

Cohen, M. D. & March, J. *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. McGraw Hill, 1974.

Cummings, N. National women's conference. Unpublished report to El Paso Community College chapter of the Association of American Women in Community and Junior Colleges, El Paso, Texas, 1977.

Cummings, N. et al. A proposal for the development of comprehensive programs and services for women. Unpublished paper. El Paso Community College, El Paso, Texas, 1978.

Faunce, P. Psychological barriers to occupational success for women. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1977, **40**(4).

Feldman, S. *Escape from the doll's house*. McGraw Hill, 1974.

Grebner, M. Women in the men's room: Women in educational administration. *University College Quarterly*, May 1977, **22**(4), 9-17.

Hochschild, A. R. Inside the clockwork of male careers. *Women and the Power to Change*, Florence Howe, (Ed.). McGraw Hill, 1975.

Howe, F., (Ed.). *Women and the power to change*. McGraw Hill, 1975.

Lavine, T. Z. The motive to achieve limited success: The new woman law school applicant. *Women in higher education*. American Council of Education, 1974.

Loeb, J. The effectiveness of affirmative action for women. *Journal of Higher Education*, May/June 1978, **49**(3), 218-230.

Rippey, D. T. & LeCroy, J. R. Training for administrative leadership. *Community College Frontiers*, Summer 1978, **6**(4), 45-49.

Solomon, L. D. & Heeter, J. S. The case for preferential hiring. *Change*, June 1977, **9**(6), 6-7, 64.

Stent, A. Academe's new girl network. *Change*, June-July 1978, **10**(6), 18-21.

Van Alstyne, C. Affirmative inaction. *Change*, August 1977, **9**(8), 39-41, 60.

Webb, L. O. & McCarthy, M. M. Debunking the myths of affirmative action. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Spring 1978, **41**(3), 105-108.

11 Interest and Involvement of Women in University Governance

JULIA K. MULLER

Although there is a growing body of research investigating the role of women in higher education, few authors have directly compared the interest and involvement of men and women in university governance. Several researchers have found differences in male and female respondents when investigating other problems concerning the role of faculty and staff members in university decision making.

Hicks (1971) examined several characteristics related to university decision making. He maintains that sex significantly relates to faculty attitudes. The men in his study favored a more influential role in governance for the faculty than did the women. In addition, men were more willing to become personally involved in governance and to a greater extent than were women. Women had more confidence in administrative and faculty leaders than did men. Eckert (1970) discovered differences in actual participation by faculty members in university governance activities at the University of Minnesota. Women were infrequently elected to the senate and were seldom appointed to the senate committees. Several committees included no women faculty members. Sutherland (1973) for her dissertation, "Nonacademic Personnel and University Governance," surveyed and analyzed the attitudes and opinions of staff personnel at Indiana University, Bloomington, to determine their interests in and concerns about participating in university governance activities. Sutherland concluded that on only one issue did men and women respond in a significantly different manner. More men expressed a willingness to serve in the governance process, and more women said that they would not serve. The purpose of Giannelli's dissertation (1973) was to analyze the opinions of faculty, administrators, and staff members at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale on the disruptions, dissent, and involvement in decision making which occurred during the closing of the University in May, 1970. He decided that the men more than the women thought that they had a greater involvement in the faculty decision-making process.

From the *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Fall, 1978), pp. 10-15. Dr. Muller is dean of student affairs, University of Missouri, St. Louis.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to compare directly the interest and involvement of women and men in university governance activities. University governance is considered as the process of involving employees in establishing policies, rules, and regulations for the total university. The areas that are examined in relationship to the decision-making process are academic affairs, personnel matters, financial affairs, capital improvements, student affairs, and public and alumni relations. Departmental, school, college, and unit decision making are not considered.

The basic hypothesis underlying the research is that male respondents will differ from female respondents in both their interest and their involvement in university governance activities.

Methodology

Population

The population studied was delimited to employees at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIU-C) so that the system of governance would be a constant. Everyone questioned would have had basically the same opportunity to participate in university governance activities by volunteering for committees or by seeking election to a constituency council. Members of three constituencies as represented by the Faculty Senate, Administrative Professional Staff Council, and the Civil Service Employees Council are included in the study. Student workers, graduate assistants, and members of the Board of Trustees are not.

There are 1,511 faculty members. The 351 Administrative and Professional staff members include a heterogeneous conglomerate of administrators, research specialists, directors, deans, assistants to the president, academic advisers, physicians, lawyers, public relations experts, affirmative action officers, and many others who do not teach but who directly support the instructional process. The 2,149 Civil Service employees are classified according to a state system. The classification includes clerical, food service, service maintenance, physical plant, and other workers who are sometimes referred to as non-academic employees.

A computer program was designed to produce a stratified random list of all university employees. The program was based on SIU-C's identification numbers and was stratified by constituency. Excluded from the program were those employees paid from non-state funds and those employees on leave, either with or without pay, and those on sabbatical. Retired employees, visiting and adjunct professors, and graduate assistants were also omitted. Employees of the Medical School and the Law School were not included since neither of these schools existed for the entire six-year period covered by this study.

The interview method was chosen since it yields a high rate of return and since it is effective in gaining personal information. The number of interviews for each sampling stratum was proportional to the total number of that class among the 4,011 employees of the university. The sample was chosen directly and sequentially from the random lists. Employees were deleted

from the sample only if they were not available for an interview. After the first one hundred interviews were completed, the data were analyzed to determine the necessary sample size.

Table 20 of *Tables for Statisticians* (Arkin & Colton, 1963, p. 145) was used as a basis for determining the necessary sample size. Involvement of the respondents in university governance activities was used as the attribute to indicate the number of interviews to be completed. The information in the table was adjusted by applying the formula below.

$$x = 350 * 4\,[p(1 - p)]$$

x = minimum number of interviews needed
350 = sample size required at chance (50/50)
p = chance of occurrence of the attribute, involvement

Since p equalled 23%, or 57 respondents, involved in university governance activities of the 251 interviewed, the necessary sample size was a minimum of 247 for 95% confidence level ± 5%. In total, 251 interviews were analyzed: faculty, 95; administrative professional, 22; and civil service, 134. Of the respondents, 141 were males (56%) and 110 were females (44%).

Interview schedule

The interview schedule was carefully constructed and pretested. It was designed to elicit several types of information. Questions were asked to determine both the respondent's interest and involvement in university governance. To indicate interest, the respondents were asked two sets of questions. First, they ranked six areas of decision making — academic affairs, public and alumni relations, student affairs, capital improvements, financial affairs, and personnel matters — according to their ideal of employee involvement in university decision making. Next, they indicated how interested they would be in serving on a committee concerned with a problem in each area. The response choices ranged from very uninterested to very interested.

The questions concerning the involvement of the respondents in university governance activities were limited to a six-year period. The beginning date used in the questions was September, 1970. The terminal date used was August, 1976, when the data for this study were gathered. This period provided seventy-two months for analysis and computational purposes. September, 1970, was chosen for several reasons. The present constituency structure dates from that time; there has been a considerable interest in governance at SIU-C since then; and a new chancellor took office. In addition, as there is always a difficulty in remembering the number of committees served on and the length of time that a committee functioned, it was hoped that the respondents would more easily recall accurately six years of committee work.

Analysis

The responses were analyzed by the *SPSS: Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences, Second Edition* computer programs (Nie, *et al.*, 1975). An interest score for each respondent was determined by the rankings obtained on the

ideal hierarchy being multiplied by the personal interest indications. The calculations were then summed for a total interest score. The importance of each of the areas was determined by the frequencies of the responses and by cumulative percentages. An involvement score was obtained by weighting the answers to the questions concerning participation and chairpersonship of constituency councils, constituency committees, and university committees. The sum of the weighted scores was then divided by the months served at SIU-C, maximum seventy-two, to arrive at an involvement score which reflected a monthly participation and permitted the comparison of data for employees with varying lengths of service at SIU-C. Direct comparisons were also made between types of service and amount of service for both male and female respondents.

Results

Hypothesis: Male respondents will differ from female respondents in their interest in university governance.

This hypothesis is not generally supported. The interest scores of male and female respondents were virtually identical. There were a few differences in the rankings, however. All respondents were asked, "How much influence do you think that employees at SIU-C should have?" The male and female respondents consistently agreed on the areas that they ranked in the bottom half (Table I). The major difference in the rankings occurs with the area of academic affairs which shifts between first and third place. This is probably a result of the large number of female civil service employees (89) and the equally large number of male faculty members in the study (81) (total 170, 68% of the sample). It is interesting to note that personnel matters and financial affairs retain their relative positions in all the rankings.

Respondents were also asked, "How interested are you personally in serving on a committee concerned with each area?" In Table II, which summarizes the responses, the area of academic affairs again is ranked differently by men and women. The ideal rankings (Table I) may be compared with the personal rankings (Table II). Most of the respondents are very much interested in personnel matters and financial affairs; this undoubtedly reflects concern and consternation about the financial problems that the University faces. Since this survey was conducted when the State Legislature was enacting the University budget, raises in salary were a major concern, and this probably influenced the ratings. Apparently, too, women are as concerned as men with personnel matters and with financial affairs. In fact, both ideally and personally, women rate these two areas higher than they rate academic affairs, which the men ranked first both ideally and personally. Women are obviously not interested in leaving the financial and personnel matters to the men. Interestingly, the respondents tended to think that employees should be more involved in making decisions about public and alumni relations than capital improvements; however, they are more interested in serving on a committee making decisions about capital improvements.

Table 1

Composite rankings of the decision-making areas: Influence of employees (1=high; 6=low)

All respondents	*Female respondents*	*Male respondents*
1. Academic affairs	Personnel matters	Academic affairs
2. Personnel matters	Financial affairs	Personnel matters
3. Financial affairs	Academic affairs	Financial affairs
4. Student affairs	Student affairs	Student affairs
5. Public and alumni relations	Public and alumni relations	Public and alumni relations
6. Capital improvements	Capital improvements	Capital improvements

Table 2

Composite rankings of the decision-making areas: Personal interest in participation (1=high; 6=low)

All respondents	*Female respondents*	*Male respondents*
1. Personnel matters	Financial affairs	Personnel matters
3. Academic affairs	Academic affairs	Financial affairs
4. Student affairs	Student affairs	Student affairs
5. Capital improvements	Capital improvements	Capital improvements
6. Public and alumni relations	Public and alumni relations	Public and alumni relations

Hypothesis: Male respondents will differ from female respondents in their involvement in university governance.

This hypothesis is supported. There is a considerable difference in the involvement in governance activities by male and female respondents. Of the respondents involved in university governance matters, 79% are men and 21% are women. There is a much greater range in the men's involvement scores, 1 to 331 as opposed to 18 to 172. Not only are men far more likely to be involved in governance activities, but they are also likely to serve longer terms. The average number of months served is longer for men in every category except for service on a university committee. However, this anomaly is a result of one extremely active female respondent. If she is deleted from the computation, the average service is 14 months which is significantly fewer than the average of 22.3 months that the men serve. It is also important to note that it is rare for a woman to chair a committee. In all, 24 women served a total of 460 months, an average of 19.16 months; 287 men served a total of 1,894 months, an average of 21.77 months. (Additional data will be provided by the author if readers are interested.)

Conclusion and Discussion

Although men and women are equally interested in university governance both from the ideal perspective of employee involvement in governance matters and from the personal willingness to serve on a committee, men are far more likely to become involved than are women. These findings do not support the findings of Hicks (1971) concerning faculty members or of Sutherland (1973) concerning civil service employees. In both populations, more men were willing to become involved to a greater extent than were women respondents. In this study, they were equally interested in becoming involved. However, an expression of interest is not the same as actual involvement. Indeed, a surprising result of the study was the finding that there is no correlation between interest and involvement (Muller, 1976; pp. 71, 102). The findings confirm the opinions of Giannelli's respondents (1973) who thought that men had a greater involvement in faculty decision making.

The women's movement probably has influenced women's attitudes and interest in governance issues, but women apparently have not yet become integrated into the male-dominated network of being asked to serve on committees and of being nominated to represent their peers on senates and councils. Although most university committees today have a token woman or two, this effort is not enough to ensure that women serve proportionately on all committees and councils. This will probably change, however, as women increasingly form caucuses and political pressure groups and as more women are hired. In addition, it is hoped that women will encourage and nominate qualified women to serve on councils and senates and will place women on committees. Hopefully, too, women will increasingly be chosen to chair committees.

Questions are still left to be investigated. Are men encouraged and women subtly discouraged from participating on councils, senates, and committees? Does an "old boy" network operate? Are there differences in the job environments for men and women? If so, what are they? What motivates both men and women to become active in university governance activities? Do men and women consistently fulfill or "play" different roles in committees and senates? If so, do these roles influence the acceptance of women on committees? Do the life styles of women make it more difficult for them to participate fully in governance activities?

References

Arkin, H., & Colton, R. *Tables for statisticians. Second edition.* Evanston: Barnes and Noble Books, Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.

Eckert, R.E. Participation in university policymaking: A second look. *AAUP Bulletin*, 1970, 56(3), 308-314.

Giannelli, A.J., III. A multivariate analysis to account for the views about campus disorder during May, 1970, of some faculty members, administrators, and civil service employees at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1971.

Muller, J.K. Socialization theory and university governance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1976.

Nie, H., Hull, C., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D.H. *SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences. Second edition.* St. Louis: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Sutherland, E. Nonacademic personnel and university governance. *Journal of College and University Personnel Associations*, 24(1), 11-49, 1973; 24(2), 37-59, 1973; 24(3), 60-84.

12 An Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Women Administrators in Higher Education

MARY ELIZABETH REEVES

It is one of my deep rooted beliefs that work makes life pleasant. During a normal lifetime, an inestimable number of hours are consumed by work, and if that work brings no pleasure or little satisfaction, it is indeed a debilitating experience.

Job satisfaction or psychic income is of no less importance to women than to men. Wolfe (1969), investigating the work habits of two thousand women, produced data which demonstrated the strong needs of women to derive a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment from their work.

Epstein's (1973) research with women in prestigious occupations indicated that career-oriented women felt driven to prove themselves. She noted that "merely getting into a profession has never been enough." Her findings, culled from ten years of investigation, give evidence that even the most talented and productive women have not been fully accepted into the elite of their professions. She reported that dropping out or being pressured out was a noticeable pattern where discrimination has existed.

Holmstrom (1973) noted that some women had been demoted in terms of the prestige of the formal positions they held, even though their professional skills and reputations were on the rise.

Both Elbe (1972) and Davis (1971) found ample evidence that women in higher education carry a large share of the heavy, low-status introductory work. In addition, Elbe found that marginal, part-time status was sometimes forced on women as a condition of employment.

The record of the past clearly speaks for itself.

Now that the Women's Movement is several years old, it seems appropriate to assess the job satisfaction of administrative women in academe to determine what, if any, changes in the working climate have occurred.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 3, (Spring, 1975), pp. 132-135. Dr. Reeves is associate professor of psychology at the College of Nursing, University of Illinois at the Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois.

Rationale

The sample reported in this study was selected for two reasons. First, as Holmstrom reported, demotions of women were particularly visible in the cases of women with academic careers.

Second, the women administrators in the sample represent a cross-section of academic fields and are employed in large midwestern public and private universities. Each of the women in the study has attained a high degree of professional success. It would seem that these women should also achieve a high degree of job satisfaction

Data Collection and the Data

During 1973-1974, ninety-six women administrators in higher education were interviewed. In this group were women who represented general education, liberal arts, nursing education, medical education, social work, and the allied health fields.

Selection of the respondents used in this study was determined on the basis of their current position and their contributions to higher education. Former administrators who had stepped down, either at retirement or after yielding to pressure, were not used in this study. Table 1 shows the current administrative position of the respondents.

Table 1

Current Administrative Position of Respondents

Category	Number	Percent
Dean	8	8.3%
Associate Dean	8	8.3
Assistant Dean	16	16.7
Department Head	28	29.2
Acting Head	8	8.3
Assistant Head	12	12.5
Director, Counseling Center; Curriculum; etc.	16	16.7
TOTAL	96	100.0%

A conscious effort was made to include respondents from both private and public universities so that the study would have validity. Seventy-one percent of the sample were single; 24% were married; and 4% were divorced. Since the great majority of women in higher education are single, the sample appears to be representative.

The interviews were based on a general format of topics to be discussed, but flexibility permitted greater input by those being questioned. The interviews were semistructured. Each interview lasted approximately one and one-half hours and permitted considerable depth.

Respondents were asked to provide general information about the number of years in their current position, their entering position and the number

of years from entry position to current position. They were also asked to name their original career goal and state whether it was self-selected or parent-selected.

The respondents were permitted considerable latitude when answering the questions, and they were encouraged to talk as long and as freely as they wished on each topic. This was particularly true when either satisfaction or dissatisfaction was expressed.

On the other hand, 75% of the women whose parents were the prime factor in career choice indicated a high level of dissatisfaction.

Conclusion

Despite a high degree of personal and professional success, this study clearly shows that job satisfaction does not come automatically with a title or a name on the door.

Reasons for lack of satisfaction were varied, but recurring themes were: being required to spend too much time on non-essential paper work; being assigned tasks no one else wants to do; and responsibility but no authority. One administrator expressed frustration about her supervisor who assigned important projects to her for her completion but insisted on checking her spelling before the reports could be distributed outside the office. (It is the author's opinion that the Women's Movement could not change that situation, and the author recommends that the administrator should "learn to laugh a lot.")

Several administrators indicated that "things" had been better before the emphasis on Women's Rights; the impact of the Women's Movement has, in some instances, created an invisible barrier rather than a bridge. These administrators believe that they are now being viewed as a threat instead of being respected for their abilities, a happier situation which existed for them in the past.

In summary, the study seems to show that the working climate has not changed appreciably for most women in administrative positions. Although more positive working relationships are certainly desirable, it would appear that like Rome, they will not be built in a day. Job satisfaction, when it is present, seems to come from a sense of personal worth rather than from working climate or other external factors.

Perhaps this is as it should be!

References

Davis, A.E. Women as a minority group in higher academics. In *The professional woman*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971, 593.

Elbe, K.E. Strengthening the position of women faculty members. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1972, **35**(4), 165.

Epstein, C.F. Structuring success for women: Guidelines for gatekeepers. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1973, **37**(1), 35-36.

Holmstrom, L.L. Women's career patterns: Appearance and reality. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1973, **36**(2), 77-78.

Wolfe, H.B. *Women in the world of work*. Division of Research, The State Education Department, New York, 1969.

13 An Analysis of Differences in Professional Attitudes and Beliefs between Male and Female Members of the College Student Personnel Profession

MARYLU MC EWEN AND BRUCE SHERTZER

During the past several years, caucuses, task forces and special committees on the status of women have rapidly emerged within many professional associations. Specifically, within the field of college student personnel work there exist the Women's Task Force of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the Women's Caucus of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), and the Tripartite Task Force for Women which includes representatives from ACPA, the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC), and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). In addition, NAWDAC, since its inception in 1916, has had as its focus the education of women; NAWDAC has also served its members uniquely by providing a way in which women members of the student personnel field could express their professional leadership capabilities.

The proliferation of women's caucuses and the existence of special professional organizations for women, such as NAWDAC, not only represent the need for a special focus upon professional women, but raise questions about differences in professional attitudes and beliefs which may exist between men and women. Two recent studies have substantiated this need. In a survey of members of NAWDAC, Berry and Fitzgerald (1971) reported that more than half of the 1,134 respondents stated that they had experienced prejudicial discrimination in their positions on the basis of sex. The ACPA Women's Task Force (1971) expressed concerns about the decline in number and in visibility of women college personnel administrators and the decreased access of these women to decision making positions within higher education.

A major purpose of this study of student personnel workers was to examine the differences in attitudes between men and women in the field of

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 3, (Spring, 1975), pp. 136-143. Dr. McEwen is associate professor of counselor education at Auburn University, and Dr. Shertzer is professor of education (counseling and personnel services) at Purdue University.

student personnel toward current professional issues. Reported here will be the differences between male and female respondents in their beliefs about professional issues concerned with the women's movement, definition and purposes of student personnel work and the role of student personnel workers, preparation of student personnel workers and research in the field, involvement and participation of students in institutional decision making, discipline and minority students.

Procedures

Attitudes of student personnel workers on certain professional issues were assessed through the use of a self-report questionnaire. The instrument, consisting of two primary parts, was developed through reviewing current literature in the field of college student personnel (from January 1968 through September 1971) to identify issues and use of a panel of judges to determine item relevancy. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of nine items requesting personal and identifying data, including primary professional organization and sex of the respondents; the second part contained 121 items concerned with current issues in the field of student personnel. These 121 items encompassed issues concerned with the definition and purposes of student personnel work, formation of a single professional organization, the role and preparation of student personnel workers, the responsibilities of professional organizations, research and evaluation within student personnel, and institutional discipline of students.

Subjects were asked to respond to each item on a five-point Likert-type scale, indicating the extent to which each agreed or disagreed with the given statement. The chi-square procedure was used to test the effect of the sex of the respondents upon their responses. The five percent level was defined as the critical level of significance.

The sample for the study was selected from the memberships of each of the three major professional organizations in student personnel, namely ACPA, NAWDAC and NASPA. Every officer (56) of each of the three organizations was included in the sample, as well as a stratified random sample of the members who were not officers. Approximately one-seventh of the members named on the organization membership lists were used, and this sample consisted of a total of 771 non-officers, including 478 from ACPA, 141 from NASPA and 152 from NAWDAC. Since respondents were asked to identify their primary professional organization, potential overlap of membership was not a factor in the final analysis.

The original mailing was completed by May 8, 1972. By the end of July, 1972, a total of 434 usable responses (52.47%) of the 827 total sample had been received; the percentage of returned questionnaires was approximately the same for each of the three professional organizations. Data presented in Table 1 report the number and percent of respondents by professional association.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Respondents by Professional Association

Professional Organization Members and Officers	Total Number Sent	Number of Respondents	Usable Responses	Percentage of Usable Responses
		Members		
ACPA	478	246	235	49.2
NASPA	141	76	74	52.5
NAWDAC	152	97	88	57.9
Total Members	771	419	397	51.5
		Officers		
ACPA	20	13	13	65.0
NASPA	22	16	15	68.2
NAWDAC	14	10	9	64.3
Total Officers	56	39	37	66.2
GRAND TOTAL	827	458 (55.4%)	434	52.5

Slightly more than half (55.5%) of the 454 respondents were men, with 44.5% women. Eight-two percent of the respondents identified one of the three major professional associations in student personnel as their primary professional organization. Of those identifying with one of the three associations, approximately one-half named ACPA, one-fourth NAWDAC, and one-fourth NASPA. As might be expected from the nature of the memberships of these three professional organizations, most women identified with NAWDAC or ACPA while their male counterparts identified with ACPA or NASPA.

More than one-third of the respondents indicated that they had completed a doctor's degree, while less than 5% had completed an educational specialist degree. Over one-half of the respondents reported that the highest degree they had completed was the master's degree. Some 4.4% held only a bachelor's degree. The relationship between sex and degree completed was significant at the .001 level, with over one-half of the men, but less than one-fourth of the women, having doctorates or educational specialist degrees. Table 2 reports the educational attainments of respondents by sex.

Over one-third of the 434 respondents identified themselves as being between the ages of 26 and 35. Nearly one-fourth were in the age bracket of 36 to 45 years; 10% were between 21 and 25 years of age, with 18.5% 46 to 55 years, and 7.6% over 55 years of age. When age of the respondents was compared with sex, it was found to be significant at the .001 level. While approximately 60% of those in the age groups 26 to 55 were men, women comprised approximately two-thirds of those between 21 and 25 years of age and of those over 55 years.

Table 2

Educational Attainment of Respondents by Sex

Sex	B.A., B.S.	M.A., M.S.	Ed.S.	Ph.D., Ed.D.	Total
Male	7	108	12	114	241
Female	12	137	7	37	193
12					
TOTAL	19	245	19	151	434

$x^2 = 40.5160$, df = 3, $p < .001$

Results and Discussion

Women's Movement. The effect of sex of the respondents upon item responses was significant at the .05 level for 28 (23.1%) of the 121 items. In general, the greatest attitudinal differences between men and women respondents occurred with items relating to the women's movement, and, as one might expect, women gave much stronger endorsement to these items.

A greater proportion of women than men expressed strong agreement that there has been a significant increase in the "consciousness" of undergraduate women about the changing status of women ($p < .001$); however, there was little difference between men and women in overall agreement with the item. Women also expressed much stronger agreement than men with the importance of good female role models in colleges and universities for young women students ($p < .001$). Tables 3 and 4 present the frequency of responses for these two items according to the sex of the respondents.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Attitudes toward the Consciousness of Undergraduate Women of the Current Status of Women

	SA	A	I	D	SD	Total
Male	56	148	26	10	1	241
Female	76	92	10	15	0	193
TOTAL	132	240	36	25	1	434

$x^2 = 20.1458$, df = 4, $p < .001$

More than half of the female respondents agreed with the statement that women college personnel administrators have declined in number and in visibility and have lost access to decision making positions within higher education, while almost half of the male respondents disagreed with the

statement ($p < .001$). Perhaps related to women's attitudes toward the decline of women personnel administrators, women believed more strongly than men that few persons with experience in student personnel work or in counseling had been promoted to top level personnel positions on major college campuses during recent years ($p < .01$).

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Attitudes toward the Need of Women Students for Good Female Role Models

	SA	A	I	D	SD	Total
Male	99	96	37	8	1	241
Female	132	55	6	0	0	193
TOTAL	231	151	43	8	1	434

$x^2 = 42.4055$, df = 4, $p < .001$

Similarly, in response to sex discrimination occurring within the student personnel profession itself, more than one-half of the female respondents, but less than one-fourth of the male respondents, expressed strong agreement with the statement ($p < .001$). Generally, women expressed much stronger agreement than did men that women's rights and education and increasing opportunities and alternatives for women are important issues facing higher education ($p < .001$). Data presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7 report the frequency of responses, by sex, for the three items relating to sex discrimination within higher education and the importance of the women's movement.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Attitudes about the Decline in Women College Personnel Administrators

	SA	A	I	D	SD	Total
Male	17	44	64	90	24	239
Female	71	52	31	34	5	193
TOTAL	88	96	95	124	29	432

$x^2 = 79.0024$, df = 4, $p < .001$

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Attitudes toward the Occurrence of Sex Discrimination within the Student Personnel Profession

12

	SA	A	I	D	SD	Total
Male	55	109	33	36	8	241
Female	112	58	16	7	0	193
TOTAL	167	167	49	43	8	434

$x^2 = 63.9596$, df $= 4$, $p < .001$

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Attitudes toward the Importance of the Women's Movement for Higher Education

	SA	A	I	D	SD	Total
Male	68	112	43	13	5	241
Female	125	51	11	6	0	193
TOTAL	193	163	54	19	5	434

$x^2 = 61.6497$, df $= 4$, $p < .001$

Purposes of Personnel Work. Responses to those items that related to the definition and purposes of student personnel work and the role of the student personnel worker were varied. While not presented in tabular form, women gave stronger support to the concept of student development and the establishment of an environment to foster maximum student growth ($p < .05$). Women also expressed stronger agreement in items relating to the individual student. Women gave stronger endorsement that a major purpose of student personnel work is to assist the student in search for identity and in development of self-discipline, self-evaluation and competence in decision making ($p < .01$) and that provision of privacy for the individual student is essential for personalization in higher education ($p < .05$). Likewise, women agreed to a greater extent that individual counseling was an important function of student personnel work ($p < .05$). Additionally, women seemed to place greater importance upon the need for student personnel workers to maintain close relationships with all other elements of the institution ($p < .05$).

Women seemed to view, to a greater extent, a need for student personnel to change and gave more support for change. Women agreed more strongly that student personnel work is rarely viewed as part of the educational process ($p < .02$). That student personnel workers can no longer realistically

carry out their missions within the confines of their offices and that student personnel must become part of the mainstream of the educational process were endorsed more strongly by women than by men ($p < .05$). In addition, women believed more strongly that abandoning the doctrine of *in loco parentis* means a redefinition and reconceptualization of the role of the student personnel worker ($p < .05$).

Preparation and Research. In regard to the preparation of student personnel workers, women, more than men, endorsed the need for formal academic preparation ($p < .05$) which would include counseling skills ($p < .02$) and actual experience in the field for the student personnel practitioner ($p < .05$) and for the student personnel educator ($p < .05$). However, women also agreed more strongly that on-the-job training is more helpful to the future student personnel worker than is formal academic preparation ($p < .01$). Concerning research, women expressed stronger agreement that the primary reason for a lack of research in student personnel is a lack of time for student personnel practitioners in relation to other professional responsibilities ($p < .02$).

Involvement of Students. Another issue dealt with students and their participation and involvement in institutional settings. Women agreed more strongly that incorporating student insights and contributions enriches the total educational programs of an institution ($p < .05$) and that students attain maturity to the extent that they are free to make personal decisions and to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the academic community ($p < .001$). Women also believed more strongly that students are now more interested in ad hoc or short-term activities than in traditional student organizations ($p < .01$). Women offered stronger support for the concept of student participation in decision making as a facilitator of student self-control ($p < .05$) and for the control by an institution over changes that it has initiated itself ($p < .01$).

Minority Students. As women endorsed special needs of women students to a greater extent than did men, women also believed more strongly in the importance for Black students of Black faculty and administrative role models in colleges and universities ($p < .02$).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The major conclusion drawn from the study is that women student personnel workers expressed significantly different attitudes from men student personnel workers on basic issues related to the student personnel profession. Particularly significant were the differences in attitudes between men and women on items relating to the status of women. Specifically, women believed much more strongly than men in the existence of sex discrimination within the student personnel profession itself and in the decline of women college personnel administrators in key decision making positions within higher education. There were also significant differences between

men and women in their perceptions of the undergraduate woman's awareness of the current status of women, as well as the importance of appropriate role models both for women and black students. Significant differences between men and women also existed in their beliefs about the importance of the women's movement for higher education.

Major differences in attitudes between men and women student personnel workers also were found on items concerning issues related to the concept of student development, the involvement of students within the academic community, the necessity for changes within the student personnel profession, and the need for formal academic preparation for student personnel work. A connecting factor to explain some of the sex differences may lie in the greater expressed interest and commitment by women to the individual student, possibly related to the different level at which women tend to be employed. The only general area in which sex differences in responses were not present concerned the formation of a single professional organization and the responsibilities of a single organization to its members.

Two major recommendations concerning the differences in attitudes between men and women were formulated from this study.

1. It is recommended that all three professional organizations — namely ACPA, NASPA, and NAWDAC, as representative of the field of student personnel work — examine closely the differences in attitudes between men and women, the possible reasons for such differences, and the implications of these differences for the student personnel profession.

2. It is recommended that another study of attitudes and beliefs of members of the college student personnel profession be undertaken in five years to determine attitude changes and professional trends that have developed since this study was made.

References

Berry, M. C. and Fitzgerald, L. E. The profile and status of NAWDC members. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1971, 34, 50-59.

Minutes of the Executive Council Mid-Year Meeting, American College Personnel Association, Denver, Colorado, December 5-6, 1970. *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1971, 12, 234-240.

14 Composite Profile of a Top-Level California Community College Woman Administrator

VIRGINIA T. PFIFFNER

Women educators may find as models a few women who are in major administrative positions in the various segments of higher education. These women have in common some qualities that women seeking nontraditional positions may wish to examine. Counselors and administrators, both men and women, should be aware of these characteristics as they encourage newer generations of students to enter the education profession.

In response to a suggestion that a profile of women who are in nontraditional administrative positions in higher education be developed, a study was undertaken. Personal interviews were conducted in 1972 with twenty-two of the twenty-six women who were in positions which fall within the first three highest ranking administrative levels of the then ninety-two community colleges in California (Pfiffner, 1972). The titles of the administrative level positions were: (1) Superintendent/President or College President; (2) Vice President, Administrative Dean or Dean; (3) Dean, Associate Dean or Assistant Dean. The titles of Dean of Women, of Men, of Nursing or of Allied Health were not included since these positions generally require a person of a particular sex.

The results of the interviews were combined and summarized to provide a profile of the representative top-level woman administrator.

Profile

The composite woman belonged to a very select group — four percent of the 631 top-level community college administrators in the state of California. She worked in a large southern California community college in a third-level administrative position with a title of Dean, was 52 years of age and had been in administrative work for twelve years.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Fall, 1976), pp. 16-17. Dr. Pfiffner is dean, Division of Behavioral Sciences & Foreign Languages, El Camino College, Torrance, California.

Educational Background

An investigation of educational background revealed that she was graduated from a California high school and a California college, receiving her bachelor's degree at 23 years of age while she was still single. In addition to earning two academic honors as an undergraduate, she participated in various extracurricular activities such as student government, athletics and clubs. These experiences proved helpful in her administrative work. Her master's degree was earned in a California university after she had married.

Family Data

A study of her family circumstances showed that she was born in the western part of the United States of Caucasian parents and had one younger sibling. She achieved a greater degree of formal education than either her parents or her sibling. She married at the age of 27 and had been married continuously for 25 years. Her husband had a bachelor's degree and was a professional man. She considered marriage an advantage in many ways — both personally and in her career. During the first year of marriage, her first child arrived; her second and last child, two years later. She felt that her children were no handicap to her career. In fact, she found them helpful in many ways, e.g., in understanding other people and in assisting in the care of the home. Her children posed no particular problem in her administrative work since her youngest child was 15 years of age before she became an administrator.

Motivation to Become an Administrator

It was found that she was not particularly aware of any woman model sparking her interest to become an administrator. The primary motivation seemed to come from suggestions made by others — usually administrators she knew. They made the suggestions that she could do the work and should prepare for it. A great deal of encouragement and support for the idea was provided by her family and friends. Although the original idea to become an administrator was suggested by someone else, her reasons for accepting the job were based on her personal needs. In her comments she indirectly expressed conflict between the socially expected role of a woman and the actual role she assumed as an administrator. The decision to become an administrator was made at the age of 39 and she actually became one at 40. She enjoyed her work greatly and believed that if she were to choose a career again, she would become a college administrator.

Observations on and Reactions to Professional Life

In her professional life, teaching was her initial type of work. This was followed by various other positions in the educational system, including lesser administrative jobs, until she achieved her present top-level position. The most enjoyable part of her job was working with people — the other administrators, the faculty and the students. She also enjoyed the creative, innovative aspects of her job and felt a great sense of satisfaction when she

became aware of growth in the people and programs with which she was involved. The most unpleasant factor in her job was the routine paper work. She did not believe that she had experienced any discrimination as a woman administrator — at any rate, she chose to ignore any that occurred. The personal characteristics which she felt were most important for a successful college administrative career were the ability to work with people, a strong personal value system and a sense of fairness and objectivity.

She believed two of the main reasons for the scarcity of women in higher education administration were the sex roles which are taught our young people and the discrimination which results from the importance placed on sex differences on the job. She thought that the number of women in top-level administrative positions could be increased by changing the attitudes of both men and women about women working at administrative levels and by encouraging women to prepare for administrative work. Based on her experience, she advised that a woman who is aspiring to administrative work should learn to know herself and be herself, should gain a broad educational background with a variety of experiences, should be patient and gentle, should be objective and should be aware that top-level administrative work is stimulating, creative and rewarding.

Reference

Pfiffner, V.T. *Factors associated with women in major administrative positions in California community colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972.

15 Women College and University Presidents: Their Personal and Professional Characteristics, Career Development Patterns, and Opinions About Their Roles

MARTHA McGEE

In 1871, when Frances Willard was named president of Evanston College for Women, she became the first woman president of an American college or university (Kane, 1974). She represented .18% of all presidents at that time. Even as recently as 1970, when Harris (1970) reported that 1% of all college and university presidents were lay women, women who aspired to high level administrative positions by necessity centered their hopes on women's colleges.

Since the end of World War II, when women surrendered to men positions they had filled in their absence, there has been an overall decrease in the percentage of women in higher education (Freeman, 1977). There was a 5% decline in the number of women in all professional and technical positions between 1940 and 1970 (Theodore, 1971), and there were fewer women principals, professors, and college presidents in 1976 than in 1966 (Silver, 1976).

Researchers consistently have reported that women in higher education were concentrated in small colleges and universities or in the lower ranks of the larger ones (Astin, 1969; Carnegie Commission, 1973; Graham, 1971; Oltman, 1970) and that most were in education and humanities (Carnegie Commission, 1973; Graham, 1971). The few women in top-level administrative positions were in third level positions with the title of Dean (Pfiffner, 1976; Freeman, 1977). Almquist and Angrist (1971), Graham (1971), Theodore (1971), and Nieboer (1975) found that many of the women in these positions were influenced by role models and college professors. As women presidents are relatively recent phenomena, there were few role models for young women who aspired to be presidents.

Dr. McGee is associate dean of students and dean of women at Jacksonville University in Jacksonville, Florida.

Nieboer (1975) stated that one of the problems facing women in administration is the lack of role models: with so few women in administration, there are few role models; with so few role models, an increase in applications and appointments is unlikely. Nieboer suggested that a profile of personality and personal history characteristics of successful top level women administrators in nontraditional positions in coeducational colleges and universities would help break the cycle and would indicate whether women holding these positions have common characteristics that can be identified.

Most studies of women in higher education have dealt with numbers and classifications or have been local in approach (Astin, 1971; Pfiffner, 1976; Thurston, 1975; Freeman, 1977). There is little information about the woman college or university president in the literature. Additionally, Cohen and March (1974, pp. 1-28) developed a profile of the male college president; no such profile of the female college president had been developed.

Procedures

The problem in the present study was to determine the demographic and professional characteristics, career development patterns, and opinions about their roles of women college and university presidents in 1978, to compare them to determine similar and dissimilar characteristics, patterns, and opinions, and to compare a profile of the woman president to Cohen and March's (1974) profile of men presidents.

Data were collected by a mailed questionnaire developed for the study and a taped telephone interview. A questionnaire was mailed to the 53 individuals identified as women presidents on December 31, 1978, of two and four-year colleges and universities, excluding Roman Catholic institutions, accredited by a regional accrediting agency. Responses were received from 48, 91%, of the individuals. The five presidents on the original list who were male, the three women who were no longer presidents, and the five women who declined to participate were eliminated from the sample. The 35 presidents who met the criteria for inclusion in the study and who completed the questionnaires, then, constituted the sample for this study. They represented 78% of all identified women college and university presidents.

Five presidents, representing two and four-year institutions, public and private, single sex and coeducational, located in different parts of the United States, were selected as the stratified sample to participate in a structured, taped telephone interview and all agreed to participate.

Findings

The 35 presidents were located in 14 states, and at least one was in each of the geographical areas represented by the six regional accrediting agencies. The New England area had more women presidents than any other region — 12 presidents (34%) worked in four states in that region. Only one president was identified in the region accredited by the Northern Association of Schools and Colleges.

Presidents in the sample represented 15 two-year colleges (13 public and 2 private) and 20 four-year colleges (5 public and 15 private). Twenty of the

institutions with women presidents were coeducational; 15 were for women only. Fourteen of the 15 two-year institutions were coeducational; 14 of the 20 four-year institutions were for women only. Table I contains the distribution of the sample of women presidents by accrediting agency, state, institution type, and collegiate population mix.

Table I
Distribution of Women Presidents by Accrediting Agency, Location, and Institutional Type

Accrediting Agency and State	Institution Type and Collegiate Population Mix										State and Regional Totals			
	Two Year					Four Year								
	Public		Private		T	Public		Private		T	State		Region	
	C	W	C	W		C	W	C	W		T	%	T	%
Middle States Association														
Maryland									2	2	2			
New Jersey	1				1						1			
New York	1				1	2		1	2	5	6			
Pennsylvania									1	1	1			
Total	2				2					8			10	28.5
Northwest Association														
Washington	1				1						1			
Total	1				1					0			1	2.9
North Central Association														
Illinois	1				1						1			
Missouri				1	1						1			
Total	1			1	2					0			2	5.7
New England Association														
Connecticut	1				1						1			
Massachusetts	2				2			1	6	7	9			
New Hampshire			1		1						1			
Vermont						1				1	1			
Total	3		1		4	1		1	6	8			12	34.3
Southern Association														
Texas	2				2		1		1	3				
Virginia	1				1					1	2			
Total	3				3					2			5	14.3
Western Association														
California	3				3	1			1	2	5			
Total	3				3					2			5	14.3
Grand Total	13		1	1	15	4	1	2	13	20	35		35	100.0

Note. C in the Table means coeducational institution and W means an institution for women only.

Demographic Characteristics

One president in the sample was under age 35, and one was over 65. Except for these two individuals, the presidents were fairly equally divided among three age groups: 28% were between 36 and 45, 31% were between 46 and 55, and 34% were between 56 and 65. The majority (70%) of the presidents were either married at the time of the study or had been married previously; over 39% of these had no children.

One president was black; 97%, including 100% of those in private institutions and 100% of those in four-year institutions, were white. Approximately 42% of the presidents reported that they were protestants, 28% that they had no religious affiliation, 27% that they were Catholics, and one (3% of the total) that she was Jewish.

Approximately half of the presidents were either only children (20%) or had one sibling (50%). Of these, 56% were first born and 44% were last born.

Eighteen (53%) of 34 presidents reported that their mothers did not work while they were growing up. Over three-fourths of their mothers were high school graduates and 17% were college graduates. Over two-thirds of their fathers were high school graduates; 44% had bachelor's degrees and 15% had professional degrees. Just under a half, 46%, of the working mothers and 59% of the fathers worked in professional, technical, or managerial fields. The husbands of 50% of the married presidents had doctorates.

Seventy percent of the presidents attended public high schools, and 70% attended private colleges or universities. Over half, 56%, attended coeducational institutions. Nearly two-thirds attended institutions in the 500—2,499 size range. Eight of the presidents were graduates of five of the "Seven Sisters" colleges. Eleven presidents completed double majors. Over half (53%) of the presidents were honor students. Major fields reported by more than 10% of the presidents were as follows: social sciences 35%, humanities 29%, and mathematics 12%. Humanities accounted for 57% of the master's degrees, education for 29%, and social sciences for 14%; no other fields were reported. Thirty-four percent of all doctorates were in education, 31% were in the social sciences, 17% were in humanities, and 17% were in other fields.

Two presidents were married when they earned bachelor's degrees; 24% were married when they earned master's degrees, and 55% were married when they earned doctor's degrees. The time lapse between bachelor's and master's degrees ranged from 1 to 21 years with a mean of 5.78 years. However, nearly half had earned a master's degree within two years of the bachelor's and 63% had within three years. The time lapse between master's and doctor's degrees ranged from 2 to 21 years with a mean of 8.28 years. Approximately 56% of the presidents had earned doctor's degrees within six years of the master's.

Career Patterns and Professional Characteristics

As they recalled their career aspirations as high school seniors, 30% of the presidents wanted to be teachers. The majority (92%) of the presidents had not planned to be administrators, but over 50% were before their 32nd birthdays. The majority did not seek administrative positions but accepted them when they were invited to apply for or assume positions or were members of religious orders and were assigned to them. The majority (71%) had spent their entire careers in the educational field and had worked in three or fewer other institutions. They had extensive experience; the mean number of years of prepresidential academic experience was 18.4. The majority (66%) went to the institution as president and had held no other positions there. Over 60% had been in office for three years or less and approximately 15%, five of 35, had been in office for more than seven years.

The majority (63%) of presidents were approached by a search committee (53%) or other institutional representative (9%) and did not initiate their own applications for the presidency. Twenty-two percent initiated their own applications.

No president reported a salary under $20,000 or over $60,000, and only one reported a salary below $30,000. The mean salary, as computed from range midpoints, was $42,370.

The majority (74%) of the presidents reported that they belonged to one or more community organizations, and 60% were current or former officers. Over 85% reported that they belonged to one or more professional organizations, and 20% were current or former officers of state associations, 30% of regional associations, and 46% of national associations. Just over half, 51%, were members of local, state, regional, or national corporation boards.

Opinions of Women Presidents About Their Careers and Their Roles

When the presidents were asked to indicate how important they considered various factors in their career development, all 35, 100%, considered timing important. The factors that the presidents considered "very significant" or "significant" were combined and are presented in descending order of the importance they attached to it:

Timing	100%
Chance	94%
Influence of a Mentor	82%
Personal Mobility	79%
Contact in a Network	75%
Leadership in Organizations	52%
Membership in Organizations	37%
Publications	36%

The majority (63%) of the presidents had role models. Approximately 57% of all role models identified were female, and 63% were in higher education. The most frequently identified role model was a college administrator, and female administrators were named almost as frequently as male administrators. The vast majority (89%) thought younger women viewed them as role models; 11% did not know. Only one president was not comfortable with the perception of herself as a role model for younger women.

The negative experience encountered most frequently by the women presidents during their careers was related to their male colleagues. Specifically, a majority of the presidents, at some time, had had salary and other benefits less than those for males in comparable positions (74%), had experienced patronizing treatment by male colleagues (71%), had had male subordinates resent their leadership roles (59%), and were not included in appropriate informal discussions with male colleagues (53%). The only negative experience with female colleagues encountered by a majority (52%) of the presidents was female colleagues' resentment of their leadership role.

The presidents identified a variety of factors that they thought had contributed significantly to their advancement to their present positions. The factors were classified according to those most frequently listed and were

as follows: appropriate credentials (a doctorate), personal qualifications, general and specific work experiences, support or urging of others, and chance. When the presidents were asked why they thought more women had not advanced to positions of leadership, 39% indicated that discrimination or prejudice against women was the primary reason. However, 30% also indicated that women's reluctance to take risks or pay the price was a causative factor.

The presidents would advise young women who aspire to the presidency to get broad experience (in teaching and administration), to pursue training in budgeting and fiscal planning, to do excellent work, and to earn a terminal degree.

In regard to the significance of their sex in their positions, 61% considered it a distinct asset and 39% considered it of no consequence. No president considered her sex a distinct disadvantage.

Over half (57%) of the presidents considered task-related activities the primary sources of satisfaction. Their opinions about sources of dissatisfaction were more diverse, but more (29%) listed people-related issues than any other. Financial issues were considered the greatest obstacle to goal achievement and were listed by 32% of the presidents.

Overall, 69% of the presidents were very satisfied with their positions, 29% were satisfied, and one was ambivalent. No president was dissatisfied.

The telephone interviews dealt with three broad areas: (1) personal costs, i.e., whether the costs overshadowed the rewards; (2) critical issues, and how the issue the president considered most critical impacted on her role; (3) career change, i.e., was the presidency as rewarding as expected and was a career change anticipated in the next five years. Although there were some differences in the responses, there was general agreement that the personal costs were great but did not overshadow the rewards. Fiscal constraints, retrenchment, and federal and state intervention were considered the most critical issues in higher education in 1978. The presidents found their positions rewarding, but factors prevented their being as rewarding as desired. Nevertheless, the presidents planned to remain in their present positions for the next five years or until retirement.

Profile of The Woman College President in 1978

The questionnaire and interview responses of the sample of presidents were analyzed and a profile of women presidents of two- and four-year institutions, public and private, was developed. The modal response was considered the appropriate criterion for the profile indicator for such a small sample.

The woman college or university president in 1978 was between age 56 and 65. She was married and her husband had a doctorate. She had either no children or two children, and was a white protestant. Although born in Massachusetts, she worked in another region. She was either the first born of two or an only child. Her mother was a high school graduate who did not work outside the home while she was growing up. Her father was a college graduate, probably had an advanced degree, and was employed in the professional, technical, or managerial fields.

She graduated from a public high school in a city and a private (most likely independent) coeducational undergraduate institution with an enrollment between [illegible]9 and 2,499. She majored in the social sciences or humanities and was an honor student. She had an earned doctorate in education or the social sciences.

Her entire career had been in education; she had worked in no more than three institutions, had held four to six other positions, and had 18.4 years of pre-presidential academic eperience. She came to the institution as president and had held no other positions there. She was approached by a search committee and did not initiate her own application. She had been president for no more than three years. Her salary was in the $40,000 to $49,000 range. The president belonged to community and professional organizations, was a current or former officer, and was a member of a local, state, regional, or national corporation board.

She considered timing the single most significant factor in her career development. Other important factors were chance, the influence of a mentor, personal mobility, and contacts in a network. In her opinion, publications and membership in professional organizations were not significant factors. She had a role model who was a college administrator; she thought that she was viewed as a role model by younger women and was comfortable with this perception.

Negative experiences the woman president had encountered in her career included salary and other benefits less than those for men in comparable positions and patronizing treatment by male colleagues. She thought that the effect of the women's movement on her career was that it had provided opportunities for qualified women and had raised the consciousness of employers.

She considered her own performance, i.e., excellence in work accomplishments, the most significant factor in her advancement to her present position. A second factor was having the appropriate academic credentials, i.e., a doctor's degree. She thought that discrimination or prejudice against women was the primary reason more had not advanced to leadership positions but that their reluctance to pay the price was a contributing factor. She would advise women who aspired to be presidents to get broad experience, to get a terminal degree, and to do excellent work, including working harder and doing better work than others.

The woman president in 1978 considered her sex a distinct asset in her position. She considered educational leader and manager the most important roles she filled in her present position. If she could change the order of importance of her roles, educational leader would be the primary one.

The tasks that the president performed were the greatest source of satisfaction to her, people-related issues were dissatisfactions, and the primary obstacle to goal achievement was financial, i.e., a lack of money. Overall, the president was very satisfied with her position.

When the profile of the woman president in 1978 was compared to Cohen and March's (1974) profile of men presidents, men and women presidents appeared similar and differences noted were in degree and not in kind. Specifically, the woman president tended to be older, to have better educated parents, and to have more years of pre-presidential experience (18.4

mean years as compared to 11 mean years). Like the men presidents, they were white, married, protestants, and had doctorates.

Comparison of Presidents of Different Kinds of Institutions

As there were only two private two-year institutions, only one public four-year institution for women only, and two coeducational private four-year institutions in the sample, all two-year institutions were treated as one class, all four-year public institutions were treated as one class, and all private four-year institutions were treated as one class. When presidents of two-year institutions, four-year public institutions, and four-year private institutions were compared, these differences were noted:

1. Presidents of two-year institutions were older: 53% were in the 56-65 age range. In the four-year institutions, 60% of those in the public sector were in the 46-55 age range, and 40% of those in the private sector were in the 36-45 age range.

2. The majority (60%) of presidents of two-year institutions were formerly or currently married, and the majority (over 60%) of all other presidents were currently married.

3. Married presidents of private four-year institutions had more children — 64% of them had two or more children; 50% of those in the public four-year institutions had one or no children, and 63% of those in two-year institutions had no children.

4. While the majority (67%) of two-year institution presidents had a religious affiliation, the bi-modal responses were protestant and no religious affiliation. The majority (78%) of four-year institution presidents had religious affiliations and at least 50% of those in both sectors were protestants.

5. The mothers of the presidents of public four-year institutions had the most education — 60% attended college; 43% of the mothers of presidents of private four-year institutions and 27% of the mothers of presidents of two-year institutions attended college.

6. The fathers of the presidents of private four-year institutions had the most education — 71% attended college; 47% of the fathers of presidents of two-year institutions and 40% of the fathers of presidents of public four-year institutions attended college.

7. The fathers of the presidents of private four-year institutions were most likely to be in professional, technical, or managerial fields — 79% as compared to 65% of the fathers of presidents of two-year and 40% of fathers of public four-year institutions.

8. While the majority (70%) of all presidents attended private colleges or universities, 50% of the private institutions attended by two-year institution presidents were church related, and 66% of those attended by four-year institution presidents were independent.

9. More (78%) two-year institution presidents attended coeducational colleges; 60% of the presidents of public and 69% of the presidents of private four-year institutions attended undergraduate colleges for women only.

10. The majority of four-year institution presidents (60% of those in the public sector and 50% of those in the private sector) majored in social

science; 14% of the two-year institution presidents did; more (29%) of them majored in humanities than any other field.

11. The majority (53%) of the doctorates of presidents of two-year institutions were in education; 40% of the doctorates of presidents of public and 53% of private four-year institutions were in the social sciences.

12. More presidents of two-year institutions had experience in student personnel work — 31% as compared to 8% of the presidents of private four-year institutions. No president of a public four-year institution reported similar experience.

13. More (43%) presidents of two-year institutions obtained their present positions by self-initiated applications than by any other method; in the four-year institutions, 60% of those in the public sector and 92% of those in the private sector were approached by search committees.

14. More two-year institution presidents were in their first year of office — 33% as compared to 21%. Presidents of private four-year institutions had the longest tenure, and 43% of them had been in office for four years or more.

15. Presidents of private institutions reported the highest salaries: mean salaries, as computed from range mid points, were $46,167 for presidents of private four-year institutions, $44,500 for presidents of public four-year institutions and $37,833 for presidents of two-year institutions.

16. Presidents of four-year institutions were more likely to have had role models — 100% of those in public institutions and two-thirds of those in private institutions had role models; 50% of the presidents of two-year institutions had role models.

17. More presidents of two than four-year institutions, 80% as compared to 65%, had experienced patronizing treatment by male colleagues.

18. The majority (73%) of two-year institution presidents considered their sex of no consequence in their positions; 60% of the public four-year and 87% of the private four-year institution presidents thought their sex was a distinct asset.

19. The presidents of the two-year institutions were most satisfied with their positions — 87% were very satisfied; 80% of the public four-year institution presidents were also very satisfied. In the private four-year institutions 47% of the presidents were very satisfied and 47% were satisfied.

Summary and Conclusions

The women college and university presidents were geographically concentrated in the northeastern portion of the United States and were not spread throughout the country. They were presidents of more four-year than two-year, more coeducational than single sex, and more public than private institutions; 69% had fewer than 2,500 students.

They are relatively recent phenomena; 60% had been in office for three years or less. Additionally, 70% had assumed office since 1970, when the women's movement became a significant force in our society. The presidents did not work their way up the academic hierarchy to the presidency of an institution; 67% came to the institution as president and had held no other positions there. The seemingly often held but undocumented belief of

women that if they do their jobs well they will be recognized and promoted appears to have been substantiated by the sample of women presidents in this study: 55% assumed their first administrative position at the instigation of others, and 63% became presidents after being approached by others.

The women in this study had characteristics similar to those reported in related literature with two exceptions: (1) their mothers did not work during their growing years, and (2) they headed more coeducational than all-women institutions. Additionally, women were more likely to be presidents of four-year than two-year institutions.

Presidents of two-year institutions graduated from coeducational institutions and worked in coeducational institutions. They were older than the other presidents, were less frequently married, had fewer children, were more likely to have initiated their own applications for the presidency, had been in office a shorter time, were paid less, and were the most satisfied with their positions. Presidents of private institutions were the youngest group; they were more frequently married, had more children, were least likely to have initiated their own applications for the presidency, had been in office the longest, had the highest salaries, and were the least satisfied.

According to the women presidents, women in higher education are supportive of each other. Many considered the support of others significant factors in their advancement to their present positions. The two factors that they considered insignificant were two that are generally considered important for young professionals trying to find their places in academe: publications and membership in professional organizations.

In summary, the woman college president in 1978 was white, formerly or currently married, childless, in her fifties, and religiously affiliated. She attended a private, coeducational undergraduate college and had a doctorate. She was in her first presidency, came to the institution as president, and had been in office for three years or less. She belonged to community and professional organizations. She considered her sex a distinct asset in her position; overall, she was very satisfied with her position and did not anticipate a change. She would advise young women who aspire to the presidency to get experience in teaching and administration, to do their jobs well, and to earn terminal degrees. The demographic and professional characteristics of women and men presidents were similar and the few dissimilarities were in degree and not in kind.

References

Almquist, E.M., & Angrist, S.S. Role model influences in college women's career aspirations. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman: Trends and prospects*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.

Astin, H.S. *The woman doctorate in America*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1969.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Opportunities for women in higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. *Leadership and ambiguity*. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Freeman, G.E. *A profile of top-level women administrators in higher education in Washington, D.C.* 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 144 4727).

Graham, P.A. Women in academe. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The Professional woman: Trends and prospects*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.

Kane, J.N. *Famous first facts*. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1965.

Nieboer, N. There is a certain kind of woman . . . . *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1975, **38**, 99-103.

Oltan, R.M. *Campus 1970: Where do women stand? Research report of a survey on women in academe*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 046 336)

Pfiffner, V.T. Composite profile of top level California community college administrators. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1976, **40**, 16-17.

Silver, P. *Women in educational leadership: A trend discussion*. Columbus, O.: American Council for Educational Administration, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 132 719)

Theodore, A. The professional woman: Trends and prospects. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman: Trends and prospects*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.

Thurston, A.J. A woman president? — a study of two year college presidents. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1975, **38**, 118-123.

16 Women as Academic Administrators in the Age of Affirmative Action

MARIAN LIEF PALLEY

Though recent studies of women in academe indicate that women hold over 21% of teaching positions, they are represented disproportionately in the lower ranks and in the non-Ph.D.-granting departments of the less prestigious colleges and universities (Deckard, 1975). Thus during the 1975-76 academic year, only 5.6% of assistant professors were women. In addition, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reported that in 1975-76, 64% of academic men had tenure, whereas only 46% of women had tenure. AAUP also reported that an income gap existed between men and women in academic careers. This gap existed both within ranks and between ranks. In the 1975-76 academic year, the average annual salary for men was $17,840; for women it was $14,420 (AAUP, 1976). Futhermore, though there are some women who hold administrative positions in American post-secondary institutions, as recently as 1970 in all colleges and universities with over 10,000 students there were no women presidents and no women vice presidents. At these institutions, 12% of the academic deans were women and 17% of the assistant and associate deans were women. Among the latter two categories were deans of schools of home economics and nursing — traditional female bastions (Deckard, 1975). At the same time, women were presidents at 13% of schools with less than 1,000 students. These colleges are most often the less prestigious, non-Ph.D.-granting institutions.

Though women are lower paid than men, are less likely to have tenure or to hold high level administrative positions, and are disproportionately located in the lower ranks in non-Ph.D.-granting departments, affirmative action is being criticized as a vehicle which results in discrimination against white males. This study was undertaken in an effort to repudiate, at least partially, the critics of affirmative action who look at absolute numbers of women in academic positions, regardless of their qualifications, rank, salary, and the status of the institution and department in which women serve.

Academic women with administrative career goals were studied to determine if equality of opportunity in administration is more myth than reality.

From the *Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Fall, 1978) pp. 3-9. Dr. Palley is professor and chair, Department of Political Science, the University of Delaware. She spent the 1974-75 academic year as an American Council on Education Fellow in Academic Administration.

The question being raised is whether equality can be measured as a single variable or if it should be operationalized as a multiple set of variables. The assumption inherent in this analysis is that equality must be seen from a multi-dimensional perspective. Thus, the number of women in academic positions is not a sufficient indicator of equality. Relative salaries, work loads, and promotion opportunities need to be studied. Similarly, the quality of the institutions at which women have had opportunities for advancement must be examined too. Inasmuch as salary discrepancies and tenuring data are readily available, this research will address itself to relative advancement opportunities. Women with administrative career goals were selected as the sample population for this analysis because career mobility is obvious if one climbs the administrative career ladder. Also, academic institutions, just as health care systems, elementary schools, and social work agencies, maintain conditions in which the proportion of administrators who are female is proportionately lower than the number of women in the field being administered. In other words, authority — the power to make administrative decisions which affect other people — has been generally denied women, especially in institutions in which men work. In all-female schools or colleges, there are proportionately more women administrators than in co-educational institutions. Thus, a gross inequality based on sex appears to have persisted in academic administration.

Background of the Study

In assessing the success of an affirmative action program, the evaluator often counts the number of members of the previously aggrieved group who have been accepted into positions previously denied them with impunity. Thus, inasmuch as women were traditionally denied access to careers in academic administration, one can count the number of women who currently are academic administrators. This can be done with relative ease and one might, in fact, find a substantial increase in the number of women who today fill these positions. One can further look at the number of chief academic officers, staff assistants, deans, and the like to generate a distribution of this employment and again one might determine that in the past several years the inequality gap has been reduced substantially. None of these indicators would, however, tell us whether or not the reality of equality of opportunity had been accomplished. A measure of "school quality," as well as the quantitative distribution measure, is required to determine if women are closing the inequality gap in higher education administration.

The sample population for this study of equality of opportunity in higher education administration was drawn from the living alumni (1965-1975) of the Academic Administration Internship Program (AAIP) of the American Council on Education. AAIP alumni were sent questionnaires in which they were asked to respond to a variety of questions on career mobility patterns, personal and professional background characteristics, and perceptions of discrimination against women based on sex. Fifty-one percent of the sample population responded, thus providing 208 (168 men and 40 women) respondents for this analysis. It has been assumed for the purpose of this study that this population of post-secondary administrators is substantially similar

in its career mobility patterns to the general population of post-secondary administrators. The only factor which may differentiate this population from the average post-secondary administrator is that, inasmuch as these individuals were selected for participation in this ACE program by the presidents of their institutions, they had, as a rule, good contacts and relations with academic administrators at the outset of their administrative careers.

Methodology

As previously noted, every living AAIP alumnus was sent a questionnaire, with an accompanying cover letter, explaining the purpose of the study. The questions were all pre-coded (though there was opportunity to provide extended comments on all of the questions). The information requested of the respondents related to their backgrounds (both academic and personal), career mobility patterns, and perceptions of sex discrimination in their careers.

When the questionnaires were returned, the data were analyzed to determine to what extent women, compared to men, had achieved success in their administrative careers. Several questions were specifically selected in order to try to make this assessment. First, it was necessary to examine the extent to which the men and women sampled were actively involved in administrative careers. Once the nonadministrators were factored out of the sample, the distribution of men and women on the basis of line and staff responsibilities was examined. Finally, the distribution of both men and women on the basis of the jobs they currently held was examined. These indicators were examined to determine to what extent, if any, there were apparent gross inequalities in the opportunities made available to men as opposed to women.

After these indicators were studied, several other variables were examined to determine if there were any apparent differences in career choice or mobility patterns for members of the different sexes. Thus, fields of expertise and publication records were examined to determine if substantial differences existed between the sexes. Finally, family variables were analyzed to see what effect they had upon career patterns for women as opposed to men.

The data for this study are presented in a rather straightforward fashion. Two-way relationships are examined in an effort to identify similarites and differences between the men and the women in the sample population. More sophisticated statistical techniques were not utilized because such analysis was not suitable, given the questions being posed and the data being considered.

The Reality of Equality of Opportunity

Career choices

On the basis of the data which were collected for this survey, it was immediately apparent that male and female AAIP alumni have tended to make similar career choices. Thus, 61.3% of all male respondents and 62.5% of all

female respondents at the time they completed the questionnaire were in administrative positions. (In addition, 8.9% of the men and 12.5% of the women were teaching, and 29.8% of the men and 25% of the women were chairpersons, researchers, or working outside of higher education.) Similarly, there was very little difference in the distribution between line and staff positions on the basis of sex. Fifty-six percent of the male respondents held line positions, 25% held staff positions, and 23.8% were in positions which were less than 50% administration. Comparable data for female respondents were 45% line, 22.5% staff, and 32.5% in positions which were less than 50% administration.

In considering equality of opportunity, the distribution of line and staff positions between sexes intuitively seemed to be a good indicator of gross apparent inequality if such inequality did, in fact, exist. Generally speaking, line connotes action; staff, advice. Line is hierarchial; staff, collateral. Line is authority; staff, influence. A bureau chief is a line official, his research assistant is a staff officer (Dimock and Dimock, 1964). It is oftentimes very difficult to differentiate between line and staff because despite the fact that classical organization theory maintains the distinction that line commands and staff advises, "in practice, staff frequently also commands and, in general, can hardly be said to carry out functions purely incidental to line" (Nigro and Nigro, 1977). Despite this operative limitation, for the purpose of this analysis line and staff have been differentiated in the classical sense. Thus, an "assistant to" or a program director was classified as staff; presidents, vice presidents, and deans were coded as line officials. In part, the use of this administrative job type criteria was based on the assumption that women were still being tracked into administrative "helpmate" positions. (However, as noted above, the women respondents were more likely than the men respondents not to hold positions which were at least 50% in administration.)

Institutional variation

One additional measure was developed to understand the degree of absolute equality which exists in higher education administration. Respondents were asked what position they currently filled; it was clear that very little inequality in access to higher positions existed for women. Thus, 14 men (8.3%) and 4 women (10%) were presidents or chancellors; 24 men (14.3%) and 4 women (10%) were chief academic officers; 23 men (13.7%) and 7 women (17.5%) were associate chief academic officers; 18 men (10.7%) and 2 women (5%) were deans of schools or colleges at large institutions; 17 men (10.1%) and 1 woman (2.5%) were vice presidents in nonacademic areas; and 72 men (42.9%) and 22 women (55%) were staff officers, department chairpersons, educational planning directors, government employees, or not involved in higher education in any capacity.

If, however, one examines the background and career mobility patterns of the women who hold the "higher level" administrative positions and then one considers the institutions at which the successful women have located, a somewhat different perspective becomes apparent. The women who have become presidents and chief academic officers tend to be located at the smaller private and often religious-affiliated institutions. Often these women

are members of religious orders. (Five of the eight women presidents and chief academic officers who responded to the questionnaire were members of religious orders.) These institutions are, on the basis of most existing indicators, among the less prestigious post-secondary institutions — with the elite private universities which grant Ph.D.'s and the public and private comprehensive research universities which also grant Ph.D.'s being considered the most prestigious. In fact, whereas approximately 33% of the male respondents were situated at comprehensive research universities, only 27% of the female respondents held positions at these universities. However, 30% of the female respondents and only 14% of the male respondents were located at liberal arts colleges. Also, 61 men (36%) and 11 women (27%) were situated at comprehensive state colleges or universities; 5 men (2%) and 2 women (5%) were at two-year colleges; and 13 men (8%) and 1 woman (3%) were at professional institutions.

It is perhaps interesting to note that the women AAIP alumni have published proportionately fewer professional or scholarly articles or books than their male counterparts. In part this might be explained by the reward structures of the institutions at which the women have tended to cluster — that is, at institutions where scholarly publications are not as highly rewarded or as readily supported.

Juanita Kreps, in her book, *Sex in the Marketplace*, noted what was mentioned above — that is, women tend to have positions in the smaller, often less prestigious colleges, with big teaching loads. She suggests that this condition reflects an "apparent preference for teaching" (Kreps, 1971). This observation strikes one as a conclusion based on incomplete data. There is another explanation for the fact that many women professors have large teaching loads. Women academics received their graduate training, degrees and early professional socialization in the same research-oriented Ph.D.-granting departments as men professors. However, the jobs available to men in Ph.D.-granting departments have not been as readily available to women.

Men who have positions in departments that reward research and writing comply with research and writing requirements if they want to succeed. Women in the departments that reward research and writing also fulfill these demands. However, both men and women who teach in schools that reward teaching and where there are heavy teaching loads, which implicitly discourage research and writing, begin to emphasize teaching — if they hope to survive in their academic environments. In other words, job placement to a considerable extent determines whether a person will emphasize teaching or research and writing in his/her career development. Inasmuch as women have been placed disproportionately in the smaller, less prestigious teaching institutions, women tend to teach and not to write! Women in schools that reward writing and research, write and do research. Sex does not appear to be a variable affecting professional achievement. The values of the institution are more viable as an explanatory variable (Deckard, 1975).

This phenomenon can be seen with clarity if one looks at the separate disciplines for the nation as a whole. For example, in 1974, 12% of all Ph.D. candidates in economics were women. Seven percent of all economics

faculty were women; but they represented only 5% of faculty at the 43 most prestigious universities and only 2% of the full professors at those same institutions (American Economics Association, 1974). Women economists are not as likely to write as men economists (American Economics Association, 1974). Perhaps the explanation can be found in the fact that women are placed disproportionately in departments which do not stress writing and research. It is difficult to accept the once widely held view that women with Ph.D.'s from often prestigious graduate departments most often prefer teaching in community colleges and four-year colleges to teaching in Ph.D.-granting universities, while their male graduate school colleagues prefer the Ph.D.-granting institutions to the smaller, often less prestigious schools.

A further difference between the men and women respondents should at least be noted. Female respondents were more likely to be humanists (F = 35%; M = 22%) than the male respondents who were more likely to be mathematicians or pure scientists (M = 29.2%; F = 10%). Though the pressure to publish transcends fields, the opportunities to publish are to some extent limited by the outlets in the humanities. In particular, the backlog which journals in the humanities face often are of several years' duration and thus access to the printed word for the humanists is curtailed. When resources and rewards are limited — as is the condition faced by many of the women respondents in this study given the kind of schools at which they are clustered — and when access to journals is difficult given the extreme disparity between supply and demand, it is predictable that women are not as likely as men to be at prestigious institutions in top level administrative positions. Since publication is one measure of academic success, and "prestigious" institutions expect their academic administrators to have experience in comparable institutions, perhaps it is not surprising that women have not succeeded in becoming high level line administrators at prestigious schools.

The role of marriage and family

One final background variable ought to be examined at this point. The marriage and family rearing patterns of the women respondents were significantly different from those of the men who provided answers to the questions. Whereas the vast majority of male AAIP alumni are married and have children who live at home with them, this was not the case for the female respondents. Of the forty women respondents, only twelve were married. Six of these married women had children at home, and of these six women only one held a line administrative position. (She was an associate chief academic officer or dean at a two-year institution.) Of the six married women respondents with no children, only one of these women was a line administrator (an associate chief academic officer or dean at a comprehensive state college or university). Of the six married women with children and the six married women with no children, one in each category (N = 2) held staff positions as assistants to a president or a chief academic officer.

Twenty-eight non-married women responded to the questionnaire. Eight of these women were members of religious orders, and of these women, five (or 60%) were presidents or chief academic officers of their institutions. (This is a proportional success rate not matched by any group of

men who responded to the survey!) The other twenty unmarried women did not fare as well in climbing the administrative ladder as their counterparts in religious orders, but they were certainly more successful than the married women respondents. Of these twenty unmarried women, one woman was a president of a private liberal arts college; two women were chief academic officers — one at a private liberal arts college and one at a comprehensive research university; one woman was a vice president in a non-academic area in a comprehensive state college or university; two women were either associate chief academic officers or deans at comprehensive research universities; one woman was an assistant dean at a comprehensive research university; and three women held associate chief academic officer positions or deanships at a liberal arts college, or a comprehensive state college or university.

There was an apparent inverse relationship between marriage and family obligations and administrative career mobility among women respondents; there was no such relationship of this variable to administrative career mobility apparent for the male respondents. When this finding is superimposed on the written comments made by the female respondents to the questionnaire, the limiting role of marriage and family responsibilities for women becomes apparent. Several married women observed that their career patterns were curtailed by their husbands' careers. No male respondent commented on career limitations caused by his wife's professional goals and aspirations (Simon, Clark and Galway, 1967).

Conclusions

Is there inequality based on sex apparent in the mobility patterns of post-secondary administrators? Clearly the data indicate that once academic women select or are selected for administrative careers, quantitative opportunities are available to them which seem to be approximately equivalent to those open to men. Qualitatively — using a relative traditional indicator of prestige, that is, a major research university is more prestigious than most four-year colleges and two-year colleges — women do not fare as well as men. Also, if members of religious orders are excluded from the sample, women do not even fare equally with men on a quantitative measure of administrative career achievement. Finally, whereas family responsibilities do not seem to interfere with the mobility of males in academic administration, they do interfere to the detriment of women. This condition may be caused by early sex role socialization which sets home and family responsibilities primarily in the woman's domain, regardless of whether or not she is employed outside the home. However, whatever the cause, it is a reality that family responsibilities alter career patterns for women with career goals in academic administration in ways in which they do not affect men. It is therefore necessary to conclude that even if discrimination based on sex is not a manifest function in contemporary colleges and universities, it remains a very powerful latent function.

References

American Association of University Professors. Nearly keeping up. *AAUP Bulletin*, 1976, **62**, 220-225.

American Economics Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. *American Economics Report*, 1974.

Deckard, B. *The women's movement*. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Dimock, M.E., & Dimock, G. *Public administration. Third edition*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Nigro, F., & Nigro, L. *Modern public administration. Fourth edition*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Kreps, J. *Sex in the marketplace*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.

Simon, J., Clark, S.M., & Galway, K. The woman Ph.D.: A recent profile. *Social Problems*, 1967, **15**, 221-236.

17 In Defense of the Dean of Women: A New Role for a New World

JEAN GILLIES

There are those in higher education today who are being persuaded that the role of a Dean of Women is outmoded and archaic and, therefore, should be eliminated or subsumed under the title of a Dean of Students. The justification advanced for this view is based upon convincing argumentation: the traditional function of a Dean of Women has been predicated upon a Victorian attitude that accepted female students as an intrusive minority within ivy covered walls built and intended for men. Therefore, this young, virginal clientele needed special protection and guidance in a male domain whose purpose and curricula were structured to educate the potential leaders of a patriarchal society. The Dean of Women's *raison d'etre*, then, has been an outgrowth and perpetuation of a nineteenth century assumption about women's inherent weakness and dependence. The presence of female students in institutions of higher learning has been tolerated and indulged as long as they have acknowledged, perhaps unwittingly, their vulnerability and have accepted their need of a mother figure.

The argument against the continuation of such a mother figure suggests that women are now recognized as mature, capable individuals who will utilize their educational opportunities as do men, and that a Dean of Students can serve both sexes impartially and collectively. This view is further strengthened by the fact that many institutions are welcoming women students and, in fact, are experiencing increased enrollments of women of all ages, but especially those in their thirties and forties (*Continuing Comment*, 1972). Clearly older women do not require someone *in loco parentis*. In addition, women of traditional college age have rejected the implicit control and supervision of a mother figure, demanding freedoms unheard of a generation ago.

This argument, advanced to support the phasing out of the position of the Dean of Women at many institutions, is readily acceptable to those who are concerned with authentic educational opportunities for women and the development of their potential. However, more careful examination of the

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Summer, 1975), pp. 156-162. Dr. Gillies is professor of art history, Department of Art, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, Illinois. At the time this manuscript was prepared, she was coordinator and consultant for women's programs at the same institution.

probable effects of a successful elimination of such a position raises doubts. I seriously question whether the argument actually justifies the conclusion and the possible results. Instead, I would contend that the same conditions that have been used to support the argument can be used to validate the retention of the position of a Dean of Women, with her function redefined to accord with contemporary circumstances and trends.

First, to dispense with a high administrative post that by tradition, if not definition, is held by a woman may depose women from the policy making levels of many institutions. In other words, a negative outcome that should not be overlooked can arise from the subsumption of a women's dean under the aegis of a Dean of Students who is apt to be a man. Few women are Deans of Students, and until affirmative action procedures are more effectively implemented, it is unlikely that many women will find their way into top administrative posts. That this is true is evidenced by the fact that it is still newsworthy when any woman does achieve such distinction; she is the exception and is worthy of special mention.

Furthermore, while it certainly is desirable to encourage and even insist upon promotions of women to administrative posts traditionally assigned to men, it is a logical fallacy to conclude from this that no woman should be appointed to positions traditionally associated with the female sex or that such posts should be eliminated entirely. The purpose of the assignment of women to "male" positions is to extend role model options for women and to break down sex related role stereotypes. This is a valid and desirable goal. However, to dispense with a Dean of Women will not contribute to that end. On the contrary, it may only replace a "mother" with an authoritarian "father" figure and, in the process, prevent the evolution of a new and necessary role model for women students.

Finally, the argument against retaining a women's dean suggests that women students do not have special educational needs in an increasingly complex society that is requiring their active participation and in which sex associated responsibilities are being questioned. To dispense with a women's dean will extinguish a position that can be essential and instrumental in helping women to adjust to these demands and changes. The reality is that women's educational needs have not diminished with increased enrollments of women and the growing number of mature female students; they have become even more important.

Assuming Administrative Responsibilities

Today, more than ever, there are reasons to maintain a position that deals specifically with women's programs and academic problems; The traditional role of a Dean of Women may indeed be outmoded and perhaps even insulting to our modern women students, but the position can be defined with authentic administrative responsibilities. Administratively, retaining a woman in a position that addresses the needs of women students can provide a necessary viewpoint as institutions of higher education seek to identify their purpose and mission in today's world.

First, the assumption that a college or university is primarily an upperstructure of higher education, the term will no longer be appropriate and will no longer be used in a prejudicial way.

Thus, a Dean of Women charged with the development of alternative programmatic possibilities suitable for women is a necessary component of any administrative body.

Supporting New Academic Programs

Since a new perspective is essential to the development of women's intellectual resources, women's deans must involve themselves in academic programming and scheduling, but further than that, they should take an active part in promoting specific academic offerings.

First, informing themselves of the intention of Women's Studies programs and promoting the offering of such courses as academically sound and necessary are constructive and responsible ways of implementing their obligation to women students.

Courses designed to explore the myths, societal conditioning and history of women are not a temporary fad. They are not the result of hysterical demands on the part of women, offered indulgently and paternalistically until the demands subside. On the contrary, if women are to assume positions of responsibility in a society that is asking and needing their participation, and if women are to be expected to alleviate the increasing pressures upon already over-burdened men, they must begin to understand themselves and be prepared to alter their own self-images as dependent persons in order to function in new roles. Courses that explore the definitions ascribed to and accepted by women can provide our female students with the objective perspective and support they need in order to define themselves as autonomous, authentic persons.

Second, women's courses do not need to be limited to self-evaluation and societal examinations associated with many Women's Studies offerings. The acquisition of skills that can be utilized in the job market can be viewed as an important aspect of women's programs. Special concentrations within academic departments that are designed to provide vocational competencies require little revision of standard offerings or curricula and need not dilute the scholarly purposes of academic inquiry. Departments of Economics, for example, can direct one course toward women on the problems they may confront in the business world, while teaching the requisite management skills and procedures, so that women will not only be aware of but more comfortable in pursuing a traditionally male oriented curriculum that includes accounting and all aspects of economics.

Such concentrations are possible in many departments and can replace the notion of a "minor" field, freeing persons to major in areas of personal interest and inclination, or vice versa.

Flexibility and imagination are the important ingredients in updating departmental options and offerings. A Dean of Women can bring attention to these possibilities and demonstrate the advantages to the entire academic community.

Identifying and Expanding Service Programs

The fact that the Dean of Women has customarily served a particular student clientele is still implicit in her role. Even as she expands that role to meet the needs of a student clientele that is changing, just as our society is changing, and insisting upon being heard on administrative and academic levels, her guidance and personal contact with women students must continue to be an important part of her responsibilities. In order to be effective in this area, however, she must identify the constituents of her female student body and differentiate among their particular needs.

In many cases, a Dean of Women will know the composition of the female clientele at her own institution well enough to anticipate the directions that her services and guidance should take in order to be most effective. This would be especially true at small, private residential colleges. However, this circumstance does not warrant an assumption that the women students at such institutions are without some of the confusions and doubts that may be more apparent among students in larger universities, especially the state supported and urban schools, where the female constituency is more varied.

In any case, most colleges and universities will probably be encountering significant shifts in female student composition, and at many institutions distinct categories can be discerned that require different guidance and counseling programs.

Mature Women. The increase of mature women students on campuses throughout the nation has already been noted in connection with programs and scheduling appropriate to their needs. They also have special concerns that require understanding and empathy in the area of counseling. The uncertainty and apprehension that many of these women experience upon entering a world unfamiliar to them suggest the need to provide both individual and group counseling on both academic and personal matters. Peer group counseling can be developed from such an emphasis, and this approach seems especially suited to this group of students. In addition, there may be sufficient interest among mature women to warrant the initiation of social groups that offer support and provide an informal atmosphere for the sharing of mutual and common problems.

Career guidance will probably be of great concern to these mature and returning students, since they are generally more motivaved to enter the job market than younger women. Testing and counseling to identify special skills should be made available as an aid for both academic programming and career guidance. Seminars and workshops that address career options and opportunities seem particularly logical for the returning student, and they can be offered in conjunction with vocationally directed academic programs.

Young Women. While mature women students will benefit greatly from supportive counseling and career guidance, the young women of traditional college age have a different situation. Many of these women are unaware of the need to plan for a discontinuous life pattern. It is difficult for young women to make a career commitment like men, as long as our educational

system directs itself to male life patterns. These women have difficulty reconciling their desire for a career with their hopes for marriage.

Efforts must be made to advise young women about the importance of outlining life plans that take into account possible disruptions and distinct phases of experience throughout their lives. Counseling in this area is especially crucial, since many of these women will likely enter the job market at different times during their lives. As with mature women, career guidance seminars and workshops can be utilized to isolate these students' special skills and career opportunities, but there should be an additional emphasis upon each one's sense of commitment and willingness to assume responsibility.

Minority Women. In addition to the two categories just cited where situations warrant a differentiation of services, there must also be a consideration of women who see themselves as part of an ethnic or minority group, identifying with the group's efforts to increase its socio-economic opportunities and mobility. At the present time it is difficult to assess the desire of such women to identify themselves with women's problems as well as or instead of their ethnic concerns, but efforts should be made to clarify the intention of a Dean of Women's role as being dedicated to promoting a climate in which all women may realize the fullness of selfhood and individual potential.

Programs for women must be far-reaching, encompassing the variety of problems that women students are confronting in higher education. In order to utilize the skills and abilities of women in a society that is demanding qualified, responsible persons who are capable of being decisive, educators and administrators must help women redefine their obligations and roles.

No one is in a better position than a Dean of Women to take the initiative in providing administrative direction, promoting academic programs and supervising personal and career guidance services that will enable women to develop the self-confidence and gain the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the challenges of a society that is asking for their active, authentic contributions.

Now is not the time to eliminate the position of a Dean of Women. Rather, now is the time to expand her role. The additional responsibilities she can and must assume justify the support and the recognition by her colleagues of the vital part she can play in higher education today.

References

Continuing comment: The newsletter of the office for continuing education. The Claremont Colleges. Fall, 1972, 7, 4.

Lewis, E.C. *Developing woman's potential.* Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1968.

18 A Critical Look at the Queen Bee Syndrome

JANE BERRY and RICHARD KUSHNER

Success is never a static thing. With the advent of acceptance and due to its impact both economically and psychologically on ever-widening circles of socially-bound individuals, the Women's Movement is now facing its next battle — that of the stereotype.

In an article appearing in the January, 1974 issue of *Psychology Today* entitled "The Queen Bee Syndrome," authors Staines, Tavris and Jayaratne describe an "anti-feminist" known as the Queen Bee. This is the image of the hard-headed, two-fisted woman executive who has succeeded where lesser women have failed, who scoffs at the notion of being supported by either a women's movement or a husband's income. She is probably much akin to the Barbara Stanwyck heroines in movies of the late '30s and early '40s, and in many ways her psychology is representative of the grin-and-bear-it rugged individualism fostered by hard times.

Deans, counselors, administrators, and others concerned with the educational and vocational decisions of young women today have a need to examine the stereotypes about women's roles in our culture. To young women considering future careers, the "Queen Bee" can become a sociological icon highly charged with negative connotations and the power to drive away female seekers of prestigious positions for fear of being labelled Queen Bees.

The previously-mentioned article appearing in *Psychology Today* has prompted a response from these authors in an attempt to review the Queen Bee concept and its ramifications in light of the Women's Movement and the many attitudes which surround it. The popularity of this stereotype has been about for years and is understood to connote an individual female who glories in her own success within the professional world at the expense of other women.

More specifically, the Queen Bee has been characterized by authors Staines, Tavris, and Jayaratne (1974) as a competitive female who succeeds mainly for the following reasons: (a) She has been allowed into the system as a "token" whose continued existence depends upon her uncompromising

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Summer, 1975), pp. 173-176. Dr. Berry is a national consultant on continuing and higher education. She is assistant professor of design and resource management, University of Connecticut, Storrs. Mr. Kushner is a counselor with the Veterans Administration in Kansas City, Missouri.

cooperation. (b) Queen Bees are highly rewarded for denigrating the efforts of other women. They are complimented for being special, for "looking so feminine" yet "thinking like a man." As a result of her severe initiation, she looks down upon the efforts of younger women to "make it."(c) Queen Bees believe that their success is entirely their own doing and therefore reject the notion that women on the whole are "second class citizens." She ignores the psychological evidence that people are products of the environment and socialization, which convinces most other women that personal fulfillment lies in being a good wife and mother. She also ignores evidence of legal and economic discrimination. If she has made it, anyone can. (d) Since she refuses to identify with other women, the Queen Bee identifies with male colleagues as her reference group. She collaborates with and concedes to those in power, opposes any group approach to success, is solely concerned with her personal success, and is eager to "win" in every phase of her life including that of wife and mother — a phase of her life that reassures her that she is indeed feminine. The Queen Bee strives to be a "superwoman" who, to oppose the aims of feminism, tacitly joins with those women who have "made it" in the traditional role of wife and mother.

However, one might question the notion that the Queen Bee is a countermilitant who opposes the aims of feminism, this opposition stemming from "personal success within the system." First, the Queen Bee is seen as engaged in an ongoing struggle to prove herself in a highly competitive system. Whether or not this results in personal success within the system is not really the issue, but rather the fact that a sense of competition continues within herself and between herself and other men and women. The notion that the Queen Bee is a woman who is periodically rewarded by her male colleagues, with whom she identifies, fails to take into account that the Queen Bee is a high achiever who needs little reward from others in order to gain satisfaction from what she does.

Staines, Tavris and Jayaratne state that the Queen Bee has, on one hand, succeeded as an individual but, on the other hand, joins in the "male reward system." According to some recent research (Goldberg, 1968; Feldman and Kiesler, 1973), other females allow her far more recognition than males for achieved status and, at the same time, look down upon her efforts to achieve. The Queen Bee who is constantly engaged in a personal struggle to gain success is in no position to identify with attitudes that denigrate her efforts. The Queen Bee, having long been exposed to this psychological sabotage from other women, is apparently quite aware of the psychological motives.

There is some research to indicate that long before she steps out into the world of work, the "traditional" female starts to fail (Freeman, 1964). Horner (1968) cites evidence for a "motive to avoid success." If, indeed, the Queen Bee does recognize this pattern for avoiding success in other women, it is a motive which she herself is eager not to identify with. The effects of having her male colleagues reward her become much less significant when one stops to consider that if she does identify with them as opposed to "women as a class," it is in order to have the freedom to exercise her talents and decision making abilities in an atmosphere that allows her to feel psychologically secure.

Other research indicates that the main reason the Queen Bee is where she is goes back to her own childhood. It may be that present identification with male colleagues is of little significance when one compares the importance of identification with the father in childhood. Heilbrun (1965) has concluded that: (a) "masculine fathers are capable of manifesting expressive behavior directed toward the daughter, thereby allowing them to model appropriate feminine behaviors for their daughters; (b) a daughter who models after a masculine father is likely to possess the dual capacities of behaving in both a feminine expressive manner and a masculine instrumental behavior, which facilitate the adjustment of girls — at least in a college environment. Here, instrumental competence is taken to mean the same thing as the ability to exercise decision making power. If Heilbrun is correct, the Queen Bee certainly does not need to overcompensate as a "superwoman" since her psychological needs have long been met and her competence in both an instrumental and expressive role realized. The Queen Bee, it would seem, is therefore much more concerned with exercising her own instrumental and expressive abilities in a "free" atmosphere than with "keeping other women down."

There is some research (Hawley, 1972) that could be interpreted as meaning that women need the support of significant males. Women entering male-dominated careers were more concerned with male support than those with traditional career goals. Only 10% of the women entering the male-dominated careers said that they would pursue present goals over the objections of significant men in their lives. But one must take into consideration that it is more likely that early experiences with males set the stage for these attitudes. The Queen Bee does not, for the most part, identify with men in the political sense, but rather identifies with her male colleagues as equals with whom she happens to share similar work experiences.

In male-dominated careers, ability becomes primary and the so-called feminine attributes become less essential. Feldman and Kiesler (1973) suggest that ability (an instrumental attribute) is essential as a criterion for prestige positions, while motivation (an expressive attribute) is thought to be a qualifier for less prestigious jobs (i.e., secretary). Ability is generally identified as a male attribute, while motivation is generally identified as a feminine attribute.

There may be some indications that the Queen Bee goes through a severe initiation in order to join and share with her male colleagues. This may be only partly true since the Queen Bee has, for the greater part of her life, had to overcome attitudes incompatible with the freedom to use her full capabilities. She has had to fight the denigrating attitudes of both males and females so that, in effect, this initiation may not be as severe as the authors assume. Since she has gotten as far along as she has on her own, she no longer needs a great deal of support. The Queen Bee wants to spread her wings and make choices on her own with as little interference from outside sources, both male and female, as is possible. Secondly, the favoring of an individual strategy is most conducive to the exercise of decision making freedom. She does not identify with group strategies, although the hierarchy in the Women's Movement contains women who are quite effective as decision makers.

If other women were to begin seeing her as a model for success rather than as a thwarter of the efforts of other women to get ahead, then things might be different. The Queen Bee has become a scapegoat for political and economic inequalities. The fact of the matter is that the Queen Bee has little power to keep other women from getting ahead if indeed it is the case that it is the male-dominated system that lets in the "tokens." If the Queen Bee identifies herself with specific male colleagues in order to gain what she wants, then it is entirely possible that women in the Women's Movement identify with specific female colleagues who are instrumental in getting things done. All of these women identify with competency — this is the real issue. Identification is not the same thing as dependency either in the case of the Queen Bee or women in the Movement. The struggle that the Queen Bee has been engaged in most of her life is one for independence.

In conclusion, it must be said that the popular Queen Bee stereotype is too narrow in focus and fails to take into account complex psychological and experiential variables. The young woman today need not feel that developing her competency as a woman must mean that she compromise her ideals in any area of life, whether it be as a wife and mother or as a career-oriented female.

References

Feldman, S.A. & Kiesler, S.B. Those who are number two try harder: The effect of sex on attributions of causality. University of Kansas, 1973.

Freeman, J. Growing up girlish. *Trans-Action*, November-December, 1970, **8**, 36-43.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? *Trans-Action*, April, 1968, 28-30.

Hawley, P. Perceptions of male models of feminity related to career choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1972, **19**(4), 308-313.

Heilbrun, A.B., Jr. Sex differences in identification learning. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1965, 185-193.

Horner, M. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Howell, M.C. Professional women and the feminist movement. *The Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1974 **37**(2), 84-87.

Staines, G., Tavris, C. & Epstein-Javaratne, T., The queen bee syndrome. *Psychology Today*, 1974, **7**(8), 55-60.

19 Sex Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate Against Themselves

SYLVIA-LEE TIBBETTS

There is substantial agreement among writers and educators that women contribute significantly to their own second-rate status in society. Stereotypes demeaning to women are taught by women as well as by men (Howe, 1971 and 1974; Mitchell, 1973); both men and women write children's books that denigrate the female role (Fisher, 1970); adults of both sexes make unconscious assumptions about a woman's "natural" talents (Bem & Bem, 1973); women permit, encourage and even revel in male superiority (Tibbetts, 1973); and they present some of the greatest opposition to women leaders (Mosher, 1972). "Women have been found to be even more condemning than men of women who break out of traditional roles" (Mitchell, 1973). Ramey (1974) believes that the most difficult change of all is changing women's attitudes about themselves, and Howe (1974) recognizes that women accept and believe in the legitimacy of their inferior status. "In fact, it has been suggested that women have so internalized the inferiority of their sex that they are the worst offenders in subverting their own feelings of worthiness" (Fillmer, 1974).

Examples set by educational leaders such as Caroline Hazard (1900), a former president of Wellesley College, and Kate Mueller (1954), then an associate professor at Indiana University, illustrate how women have contributed to the subjugation of their sex. Hazard, expounding on the topic of the "ideal woman," wrote, "the lesson of greatest importance which our ideal woman must learn, is the lesson of obedience," and, furthermore, "blind obedience is better than no obedience." Half a century later, Mueller explained that grooming, manners, personal attractiveness and ethical standards were much more important for a woman than for a man, and that it was "more becoming" for a girl to be dependent while a man learned to be independent. Young women, who were, according to Mueller, "frankly motivated toward a campus experience . . . by the rich opportunities for meeting eligible men," were held responsible for governing the moral behavior of both men and women. Evidently, college men, but not college

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Summer, 1975) pp. 177-183. Dr. Tibbetts has recently completed the Ph.D. in reading at the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania.

women, were expected to be sincerely interested in an education; college women, but not men, came to school to snare spouses, and college women, but not men, were responsible for their behavior toward members of the opposite sex. To find such attitudes and double standards upheld by articulate and influential women is to recognize clearly that women have had a great deal to do with keeping women "in their place."

Other factors make it appear that women must prefer their subordinate position in society. Equal or superior to men in every significant respect (Montagu, 1974) except muscular strength, women still take the inferior position. When one considers their intelligence (Gaito, 1959; Terman & Miles, 1936, p. 1), their greater numbers (Howe, 1974), and their many skills, as well as their superior health, greater stamina and longer lives (Gaito, 1959; Montagu, 1974, pp. 31, 62, 89), it seems obvious that women would not have to act out an inferior role if they chose not to do so.

When one speaks of "choice," however, one is not always speaking of a free, intelligent or educated choice. A choice can be coerced; people can be — and are — influenced or trained to believe and behave in certain ways. "The so-called freedom-to-choose is illusory, and it cannot be invoked to justify the society which controls the motivation to choose" (Bem & Bem, 1973). Society rewards the male who is stereotypically masculine and takes the superior position, but it regards the woman who tries to be successful and independent in a "man's" world as "deviant" (Epstein, 1974). Twenty years after Kate Mueller's article, little boys are still expected to become independent, while little girls are taught to remain dependent (Engin, *et al.*, 1973). Women "choose" to be inferior — not because they are, nor necessarily because they want to be — but because: (a) they have been taught to believe they are or should be inferior; (b) they are afraid to appear "unfeminine;" or (c) they are not fully aware of their situation and do not realize that they are being treated as second-class citizens or that they do have a legitimate complaint.

Rather than holding women entirely responsible for their position in society, then, it would be more accurate to view them as "victims" of a culture so steeped in patriarchy that women — and men — cannot help internalizing the notion of female inferiority and transmitting it to the next generation (Fisher, 1970). Densmore (1970) points out that the attitudes of sexism and male supremacy that are held by both men and women are the "real enemy." These sexist attitudes are instilled by influences that permeate our society so thoroughly that there is no escaping the "web of socialization procedures which begins early and is an ongoing process — continuous, reinforcing, unrelenting" (Epstein, 1974). Under these circumstances, sexist beliefs harden into "emotional habit" (Gornick, 1973), accounting for the widely held tenets that women are innately inferior and that they lose their "femininity" if they are noticeably successful in "masculine" pursuits.

The "Innate Inferiority" of Women

Assumptions of women's inferiority are deeply imbedded in the consciousness of both men and women and begin early in life. Chasen (1974) reported that prekindergarten children believed that males were smarter,

stronger, fixed cars and worked better, and *were* better — although females were better cooks! Furthermore, the boys had a better self-image than did the girls. In another study, 3rd-, 4th-, and 5th-grade girls were so "severely inhibited" by sex-role conditioning that they protested performing science-toy tasks, saying, "I'm a girl; I'm not supposed to know anything about things like that!" (Howe, 1971). Maccoby (1966) reported that boys evaluated their own abilities more realistically than did the girls, who tended to underrate themselves (p. 32).

The male's superior self-image and the female's debasement of her own sex are found also in adults. Sherriffs and McKee (1957) reported that while men, in describing their sex, emphasized men's desirable characteristics, women stressed women's *un*favorable traits, criticizing themselves to a far greater extent than the men criticized themselves. Sherriffs and Jarrett (1953) presented evidence indicating that women attribute more socially undesirable traits to women than to men. Fernberger (1948) found that both men and women (a) considered women the cause of "trouble"; (b) thought women talked too much; and (c) believed men were much more intelligent and superior in every way to women.

"Femininity and being female is socially devalued by members of both sexes" (Baumrind, 1972). Girls often find little reward in their feminine role and may repudiate it, at least in part. Flammer (1971) found that the highest self-esteem was associated with high sex-role orientation in boys and low sex-role adoption in girls; and Sears (1970) observed that femininity is associated with low self-evaluation in both sexes. Women and girls, as well as men and boys, also tend to value males and their accomplishments far more than they value females and their accomplishments (Bem & Bem, 1973; Flammer, 1971; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957 & 1959; Mosher, 1972; Rosenkrantz, *et al.*, 1968; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957). In testing reported by Howe (1971), "The boys' contributions were more highly valued — both by other boys and girls — than the girls' contributions." Smalley (1973) reported that "women rated paintings and publications produced by women lower than identical works with men's names attached. In every category, women rated men higher."

Contributing further to women's low opinions of themselves is the fact that stereotypically masculine traits, such as independence, dominance, competition, achievement drive, leadership, decisiveness and logic, are considered more socially desirable than are stereotypically feminine attributes, such as dependence, emotionalism, submissiveness, passivity, indecisiveness, and lack of logic (Broverman, *et al.*, 1970; Mosher, 1972; Rosenkrantz, *et al.*, 1968). Broverman (1970) found that both men and women agreed that for an adult, regardless of sex, stereotyped male characteristics were "healthier" than were stereotyped female characteristics; he concluded that the attributes used to describe women seemed to be "a most unusual way of describing a mature, healthy individual."

Women's "Fear of Success"

Both men and women equate self-assertive, independent strivings, aggressive thinking, initiating, exploring, and intellectual achievement in

women with loss of femininity so extensive that it endangers their heterosexual relationships (Baumrind, 1972; Epstein, 1974). Some women who could be successful in career roles are, instead, "blocked by society's trump card: the feeling that one cannot have a career and be a successful woman simultaneously" (Bem & Bem, 1973).

In a study discussed by many writers (Alper, 1973; Bem & Bem, 1973; Feather & Raphelson, 1974; Gornick, 1973; Karabenick & Marshall, 1974; Morgan & Mausner, 1973; West, 1971), Matina Horner (1969) presented evidence that some women, fearful of appearing "unfeminine," do not develop their talents, abilities and interests because of this fear. After spending several years investigating the causes of failure to achieve in intellectually gifted women, Horner concluded that some females do equate intellectual achievement with loss of femininity and fear that success will hinder their social life and interfere with their popularity with males. "Success inhibits social life for the girls; it enhances social life for the boys" (Horner, 1969).

The more destructive effects of sex-role socialization may be initially apparent in adolescent girls. By the time they reach high school, girls start to underachieve (West, 1971). "Some of them are afraid to assert themselves in class discussions" (McLure, 1971); they avoid challenges (Frazier & Sadker, 1973); their performance on ability tests begins to decline (Engin, *et al.*, 1973); and, in spite of grades that are better than boys' grades, "girls are less likely to believe that they possess the ability to do college work" (Engin, *et al.*, 1973). Then, idealizing the sex roles prescribed by our culture (West, 1971) and feeling that early marriage is the only way to prove their femininity (Brown, 1962), girls "may lower their sights with regard to a career and decide that finding the right husband is the ultimate key to personal success" (McLure, 1971). Bohan (1973), who found evidence of low self-concept in adolescent girls, attributed these self-concepts to society's ideal of the female role:

> As the adolescent girl comes to recognize that the role she is expected to assume as a female is relatively inferior in status and prestige to the male role, the assumption of her sex-role results in a corresponding decrease in her own evaluation of herself. That is, the adolescent girl accepts and incorporates society's evaluation of her role as inferior, and so values herself less.

Other researchers (Alper, 1973; Lesser, *et al.*, 1963) suggest that some women can accept competition and achievement as part of the female role, and Feather and Raphelson (1974) found that women seemed to display less fear of success than was indicated by the Horner (1969) study. Nevertheless, "pressure on women not to achieve too much pervades the socialization of girls" (Heide, 1969), and fear of success "is assumed to be a stable personality characteristic learned early in life as a part of female sex-role standards" (Karabenick & Marshall, 1974).

Women Are "Unaware" of Discrimination

One of the most insidious elements of sex-role stereotyping is the very innocence with which it has been perpetrated. Some women are not aware of

the injustices that have been committed against them (Montagu, 1974, p. 5) and do not recognize the inequity of their position. They embrace the tenets of sex-role discrimination wholeheartedly, convinced that they like things the way they are. Such women seem to revel in their second-class status and defend zealously their rights to be discriminated against. As one high school teacher expressed herself with memorable firmness, "The Bible says a woman comes second to her husband, and that's the way I want to be, second to my husband!" (Tibbetts, 1973).

If one wonders why an intelligent human being would voluntarily acquiesce to such a limited role in life, bear in mind that acquiescence may not always be as voluntary as it appears. Individuals are "subtly and gradually . . . programmed for society unaware of the powerfully influential forces pressuring them to conform to stereotype" (Britton, 1973). "Women are tracked into the less productive, less interesting, less honored, more dead-end places with little recognition of what had happened to them along the way. They exhibit the internalized myth that they themselves determined the choices of their lives" (Epstein, 1974).

Historically, women have always been conditioned to be inferior (Schuman, 1971), and rarely have they attempted to take advantage of opportunities to promote themselves (Alexander, 1974). The socialization process reinforces women in their nurturant, docile, submissive and conservative roles and discourages self-assertion, achievement and independence (Block, 1973). Women have not been encouraged to develop their full capacities; instead, they have been taught that men's development is more important than theirs and that they, themselves, are less valuable (Miller & Mothner, 1971). Because of their socialization, women are more dependent than men, lack self-confidence and underrate themselves (Hoffman, 1973).

When individuals do not realize that a situation exists, there is nothing they can do to improve it; and when people have been propagandized since birth to live by sexist doctrines that "have stood basically unchallenged throughout centuries" (Engin, *et al.*, 1973), it is difficult to make them question dogma that they have never seen opposed by anyone. The ideology of sexism has existed "without awareness" in our society because of the lack of a conflicting belief system that would permit an alternative conception of the world (Engin, *et al.*, 1973). Society is sexist by default.

Once aware of the sexist nature of our culture, women can — and must — be responsible for the improvement of their own position in society. They can become so certain of their own sex-identity that they know there is almost nothing they can do that can make them "unfeminine," for, in demonstrating characteristics and performing tasks now termed "masculine," they are not taking on a masculine role, but are expanding the feminine role. They can advance social thinking to the point where sexual identity will mean "the earning of a sense of self in which there is a recognition of gender secure enough to permit the individual to manifest human qualities our society, until now, has labeled as unmanly or unwomanly" (Block, 1973). To this end, women must learn to view their present status as a legitimate basis for dissatisfaction, decide for themselves what is right for them, and stop mindlessly following the dictates of a sexist society.

References

Alexander, S. Will power change women? *Newsweek*, April 1, 1974, 30.

Alper, T.G. The relationship between role orientation and achievement motivation in college women. *Journal of Personality*, 1973, **41**(1), 9-31.

Baumrind, D. From each according to her ability. *School Review*, 1972, **80**(2), 161-197.

Bem, S.L. & Bem, D.J. On liberating the female student. *The School Psychology Digest*, 1973, **2**(3), 10-18.

Block, J.H. Conceptions of sex-role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 1973, **28**(6), 512-526.

Bohan, J.S. Age and sex differences in self-concept. *Adolescence*, 1973, **8**(31), 379-384.

Britton, G.E. Sex stereotyping and career roles. *Journal of Reading*, 1973, **17**(2), 141-148.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1970, **34**(1), 1-7.

Brown, D.R. Value change in college women. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1962, **25**(4), 148-155.

Chasen, B. Sex-role stereotyping and prekindergarten teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 1974, **74**(4), 220-235.

Densmore, D. Who's saying men are the enemy? Pittsburgh, Pa.: KNOW, INC., 1970.

Engin, A.W., Leppaluoto, J., & Fodor, I. Male and female — The mutually disadvantaged. *The School Psychology Digest*, 1973, **2**(3), 2-10.

Epstein, C.F. Structuring success for women. *The Education Digest*, 1974, **39**(6), 56-59. Condensed from *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, 1973, **27**(1), 34-41.

Feather, N.T. & Raphelson, A.C. Fear of success in Australian and American student groups: Motive or sex-role stereotype? *Journal of Personality*, 1974, **42**(2), 190-201.

Fernberger, S.W. Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1948, **43**, 97-101.

Fillmer, H.T. Sexist teaching — What you can do. *Teacher*, 1974, **91**(5), 30-32.

Fisher, E. The second sex, junior division. *The New York Times Book Review*, May 24, 1970, **6**, 44.

Flammer, D.P. Self-esteem, parent identification and sex role development in preschool age boys and girls. *Child Study Journal*, 1971, **2**(1), 39-45.

Frazier, M. & Sadker, M. School against boys! School against girls! *The Instructor*, 1973, **83**(7), 92-97.

Gaito, J. Sex differences in intelligence. *Psychological Reports*, 1959, **5**, 169-170.

Gornick, V. Why Radcliffe women are afraid of success. *New York Times Magazine*, January 14, 1973, 10-11, 54, 56, 58-62.

Hazard, C. *Some ideals in the education of women*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1900.

Heide, W.S. The reality and challenge of the double standard in mental health and society. Chatham College Conference, May, 1969. Pittsburgh, Pa.: KNOW, INC., 1969.

Hoffman, L.W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motive. *The School Psychology Digest*, 1973, **2**(3), 18-23.

Horner, M. Why bright women fail. *Psychology Today*, 1969, **3**(6).

Howe, F. Sexual stereotypes start early. *Saturday Review*, October 16, 1971, 76-82, 92-94.

Howe, F. Sexism in education and the aspirations of women. *Changing Education*, 1974, **5**(4), 30-34.

Karabenick, S.A. & Marshall, J.M. Performance of females as a function of fear of success, fear of failure, type of opponent, and performance-contingent feedback. *Journal of Personality*, 1974, **42**(2), 220-237.

Lesser, G.S., Krawitz, R.N., & Packard, R. Experimental arousal of achievement motivation in adolescent girls. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1963, **66**(1), 59-66.

Maccoby, E.E. Sex differences in intellectual functioning. In E. Maccoby (Ed.), *The development of sex differences*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. The differential evaluation of males and females. *Journal of Personality*, 1957, **25**(3), 356-371.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1959, **64**(4), 356-363.

McLure, G. Sex discrimination in schools. *Today's Education*, 1971, **60**(8), 33-35.
Miller, J.B. & Mothner, I. Psychological consequences of sexual inequality. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1971, **41**(5), 767-775.
Mitchell, E. The learning of sex roles through toys and books: A woman's view. *Young Children*, 1973, **28**(4), 226-231.
Montagu, A. *The natural superiority of women*. New York: Collier Books, 1974.
Morgan, S.W. & Mausner, B. Behavioral and fantasied indicators of avoidance of success in men and women. *Journal of Personality*, 1973, **41**(3), 457-470.
Mosher, J. Masculinity and femininity. *Connecticut Conference on the Status of Women: 51% Minority*. NEA/USOE-0-72-2507, Storrs, Connecticut, 1972.
Mueller, K.H. Sex differences in campus regulations. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1954, **32**(9), 528-532.
Ramey, E. Cited by L.C. Pogrebin. The working woman. *The Ladies' Home Journal*, 1974, **91**(4), 38, 40.
Rosenkrantz, P., Bee, H., Vogel, S., Broverman, I. & Broverman, D.M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1968, **32**(3), 287-295.
Schuman, P. Sugar and spice . . . *School Library Journal*, 1971, **17**(5), 5.
Sears, R.R. Relation of early socialization experiences to self-concepts and gender role in middle childhood. *Child Development*, 1970, **41**(2), 267-289.
Sherriffs, A.C. & Jarrett, R.F. Sex differences in attitudes about sex differences. *The Journal of Psychology*, 1953, **35**, 161-168.
Sherriffs, A.C. & McKee, J.P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. *Journal of Personality*, 1957, **25**(4), 451-464.
Smalley, D. Are we lowering the self-esteem of girls? *School and Community*, 1973, **59**, 19.
Terman, L.M. & Miles, C.C. *Sex and personality, studies in masculinity and femininity*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1936.
Tibbetts, S. The "enemy" is us. Pittsburgh, Pa.: KNOW, INC., May, 1973.
West, A.G. Women's liberation or, exploding the fairy princess myth. *Scholastic Teacher*, November, 1971, 6-13.

20 Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration

R. SUSAN GORDON and PATRICIA G. BALL

Much has been written about women in educational administration, but a quick glance around this country will show that, in higher education, women are generally administering women-related programs: affirmative action, women's projects, women's colleges. Little has been written or researched, however, to suggest what institutions of higher education are or should be doing to equip women to move upward into the central administrative structure. The recent proliferation of literature about administrative opportunities for women reflects the problems of socialization and stereotyping, the limited access to education and employment opportunities, the lack of affirmative action by educational institutions and the dearth of female role models for women setting their career goals. Even in the face of the present federal legislation we are painfully aware of what institutions are doing to train, recruit and promote capable women into responsible administrative positions. At best, the answer is "not much" and in most cases, a definite "nothing." Over and over studies are showing that women are not gaining ground but, in fact, losing what little gain they have claimed. Peggy Elder warns that

> Indeed, the recent minor changes may lull women and administrators into a complacency which could stifle further increases and permit some to argue in favor of the status quo (Elder, 1975).

The question then becomes, not what are institutions doing for women, but rather what are we as women doing for ourselves and what are we willing to do for each other. Obviously, competence is not enough, but why should that surprise us — it rarely ever is. The "old boy" network has always existed to teach those all-important "informal" ropes of the profession to chosen male proteges: the introductions to professional colleagues, the personal recommendations for fellowships, the intervention for those top job opportunities. Bernice Sandler (1974) suggests that men are often uncom-

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (Winter, 1977), pp. 46-48. Ms. Gordon is a realtor in Nashville, Tennessee, and Dr. Ball is director of public information for the City of Knoxville, Tennessee.

fortable with female students and hence they seldom become proteges. Correspondingly, Judy Long-Laws (1976) espouses the theory that most women who have made it into administration have had male mentors: male colleagues who served to provide those opportunities generally reserved for male proteges.

We, as women in administration, must begin to seek out and provide opportunities for other women, through inservice programming and intern experiences. We must accept the responsibility to recommend and recruit capable women whenever our input is solicited and to speak up with our recommendations when it is not.

Konnilyn Feig says that what we are attempting is the impossible:

> We are trying to change an institution that is in its worst crisis in decades. The characteristics of higher education today must be kept in mind: fear, panic, insecurity . . . . To change that institution, we must plan our strategy around the strongest and most vital motivation present within the walls on the part of most: survival dynamics (Feig, 1973).

Survival dynamics *is* what we are about, and when we get down to the "nitty gritty," that includes national, regional and local workshops to equip women with the strategies as well as the skills for moving into the administrative mainstream.

A thorough understanding of the nature of discrimination as well as the legal means to combat it are vital tools for women seeking administrative roles. Although considerable progress has been made in changing laws, women have not obtained all their legal rights. While numerous laws exist to guarantee these rights including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the 1963 Equal Pay Act; Executive Order 11245, as amended by Executive Order-11375; Title IX of the Executive Order 11375; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, our problem is educating women and men to the common but subtle aspects of discrimination. They have come to accept discrimination in taxes, credit and wages as well as in employment and educational opportunities.

The idea, for example, that neither women nor men would willingly work under female management is one discriminatory argument used to keep women out of the central administrative hierarchy. Considerable available research suggests that those women and men who have worked for a woman have found the experience to be positive, that women supervisors were inclined to assist both men and women in their efforts to advance, and were more democratic in their administrative practices. This last fact was established in 1966 by a University of Florida Kellogg leadership study team, who found the response so surprising that the researchers carefully checked their work, but the result remained the same (Taylor, 1973).

In defining survival strategies for women in adminsitration, therefore, one goal must be the development of those coping skills which will enable them to respond to dehumanizing behavior in an assertive and intrinsically rewarding manner. This positive, integrative behavior can only emerge as women begin to look within themselves and to other women for support and feedback.

An understanding of the politics of personal power is essential if women are to become effective administrators, to take on the risk, responsibilities and excitement of being autonomous and of having the freedom to shape their individual lives as well as to affect the future of higher education. Recruiting women for high administration positions means changing the status quo, and change is never easy — no less so when it is a challenge to the white, male dominated power base. Adrienne Rich asserts that the university is above all a hierarchy.

> At the top is a small cluster of highly paid and prestigious persons, chiefly men, whose careers entail the services of a very large base of ill-paid or unpaid persons, chiefly women. . . . In its very structure, then, the unviersity encourages women to continue perceiving themselves as means and not as ends — as indeed their whole socialization has done (Rich, 1975).

Men in administration realize the importance of fiscal control and planning. The fact that women neither realize the importance of working with budget nor seek out budgeting experience is the grown-up version of "girls aren't good at arithmetic." A recent study of women in continuing education administration undertaken by the Association for Continuing Higher Education showed that the majority of women in this area of administration had no responsibility for fiscal planning or personnel supervision (Sisley, 1975).

Women need testing grounds and opportunities to develop their own strategies and skills to administer effectively. *On Campus with Women*, the newsletter of the Project on the Status and Education of Women within the Association of American Colleges, reports that less than five percent of the colleges and universities in the United States are headed by women, and seventy-five percent of those positions which *are* held by women are within small church-related institutions (Long-Laws, 1975). Correspondingly, the University Council for Educational Administration survey revealed that only two percent of the faculty responding to their questionnaire were women. Of these 1,333 professors of educational administration, *only 24 were women* (Campbell & Newell, 1973).

Let us start by providing female mentors. Given the lack of female models in the profession and in the training programs for educational administration, a woman entering higher education generally evaluates her own future in terms of limited ambitions and possibilities. It is the responsibility of those of us who are now on college and university campuses to serve as "mentors," to make sacrifices if necessary to see that opportunities for women begin to become fair, open and equitable — to survive. If that sounds martyrized, the truth is, things are not getting better and we can no longer afford to simply sit back and decry the lack of female colleagues, or even worse allow ourselves to fall into the "Queen Bee" syndrome.

We do not believe that women have to accept the philosophies of administration espoused today by our male-oriented society in order to get ahead. We are all naive, however, if we think we can ever make any headway without our own base of support and power, or insights into and defenses to deal with the arguments and stereotypes which have sought to alienate women from one another.

Twenty Survival Strategies You Can Start Immediately

1. Find out who is responsible for Affirmative Action, EEO and Title IX on your campus. Invite that individual to lunch or a seminar with other campus women.

2. Enroll in an assertiveness training group or organize one with other administrative and faculty women. Encourage female students and co-workers to participate in assertiveness training and consciousness raising.

3. Keep yourself posted on professional vacancies on your campus; share this information with other women in your institution as well as at other schools.

4. Give your dean or department head a list of the names and addresses of the women's caucuses within your professional associations. Then follow up when vacancies arise to see that he or she uses it.

5. Join professional organizations and actively participate (hold offices, serve on commitees, write articles, develop workshops, attend meetings, volunteer!).

6. Join professional organizations whose primary membership is women in administrative roles (such as the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors or the National Council of Administrative Women in Education).

7. Establish ties with community women's organizations (like NOW, AAUW, League of Women Voters, BPW, and women's centers).

8. Involve yourself in your campus Commission for Women (you need not be a member to attend open meetings, request minutes, express an interest, or respond to an issue).

9. Go to your Chancellor, Provost or President and express your desire to serve on university committees and/or special projects.

10. Establish a women's caucus on your campus. Intra-institutional communication is important, but also spend time analyzing the power structure and decision making practices at your university.

11. Find out who new female staff members are each fall and invite them to a women's caucus gathering.

12. Give credit where credit is due, and give support to women in your institution who are challenging the system (headway they make will be your gain also).

13. Blow your own horn to your supervisors — let them know the worthwhile things you are doing and the positive image you are projecting for your division.

14. Support male colleagues who are attempting to promote opportunities for women.

15. Analyze your own working practices with clerical staff to insure that you are not practicing those things you find dehumanizing in the main administrative structure.

16. Work with the College of Education to provide beneficial practicum experiences for graduate women. (Share strategies as well as experiences, and failures as well as successes.) Be open to learn from your students.

17. Share the power — delegate responsibility and involve people in the

decision making process; keep them informed of all the information that is needed to make a decision.

18. Find out when budget planning begins and ask to be included. Attend open hearings on the budget.

19. Be aware of your use of the generic "he" and begin to change both your writing and speaking to reflect "she/he."

20. Discuss salaries; ask for a salary review. Open discussion of salaries is one way to determines whether women are being treated equitably.

References

Cambell, R.F., & Newell, L.J. *A study of professors of educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Elder, P. Women in higher education: Qualified, except for sex. *NASPA Journal*, Fall 1975, 13(2), 9.

Feig, K. Higher education and the woman professional. Unpublished speech given at the University of Georgia conference, "The American woman: Who will she be?" 1973.

Long-Laws, J. Psychology of tokenism: An analysis. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 1975, 1(1), 51.

Long-Laws, J. *On campus with women*, April 1976, 13, 5.

Rich, A. Toward a woman-centered university. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 21, 1975, 32.

Sandler, B. Backlash in academe: A critique of the Lester report. *Teachers College Record*, Fall 1974, 76(1), 409.

Sisley, R.C., chairperson. 1974 report of the committee on the status of women in higher education. *Proceedings, Association for Continuing Higher Education*, 125.

Taylor, S.S. Educational leadership: A male domain. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October 1973, 55(2), 125.

21 Survival Dynamics Revisited: A Reaction to Twenty Strategies

DOROTHY I. MACCONKEY

In the winter of 1977 an article by R. Susan Gordon and Patricia G. Ball entitled "Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration" was published in the *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors* (Vol. 40, No. 2). The aim of the article was to list twenty survival strategies which the authors pointed out could be helpful to women in the development of coping skills.

Gordon and Ball urged the development of such "coping skills" so that "dehumanizing behavior" could be met in an "assertive and intrinsically rewarding manner." They went on to say that the "positive, integrative behavior" they described "can only emerge as women begin to look within themselves and to other women for support and feedback."

Their assumption is that women need to band together to stave off alienation from one another which originates in arguments and stereotypes about women. My assumption is that if women take their scarce available time to band together they will not survive, but rather will be isolated and doomed to a monastically separate status on the campus. The time available to campus women can be more productively spent in the development of personal power. Off-campus there is some justification for belonging to a diversity of groups, some of which are made up primarily of women members.

To begin with, authors Gordon and Ball posit that women must have an understanding of the "politics of personal power." No question. There are only a few positions at the top in any organization; there are many seekers. Personal power *is* needed, assuming credentials are competitive and there is a sincere desire to hold the position. Their assumption falls flat, it seems to me, because they develop strategies to encourage women only. In their view, this scheme is parallel to the "old boy network" in which men work with men only. But the result of this parallelism for women only can lead to moaning together when one of the women's "caucus" does not get the nod of the University Search Committee. Why? Because the university campus of today is made up of many men and some women. Therefore, all strategies must consider the reality. Strategies need to be geared to the realization that a

Dr. MacConkey is associate dean, College of Arts & Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.

mix of males and females at the top comes about because males and females all the way up and all the way down the hierarchy work together as a team. I like to think that this team is committed to delivering quality higher education, and that well-selected administrators are a part of that delivery system.

For anyone in educational administration, male or female, the concept which spells the difference between continuing movement up the hierarchy and remaining in a static position is that of personal power; What is personal power? Implicit in the list of twenty strategies of Gordon and Ball are at least three qualities which blend to become personal power.

First, there is reputation. The possessor of personal power is well-known on campus. The person makes a point of knowing everyone and, in turn, is known by almost everyone (relative to the total size of the institution of course). The possessor of personal power is known as someone who is active, who works hard to launch new and helpful programs for students, faculty and administrators. In doing so the person meets a diversity of individuals. The possessor also makes a point of maintaining friendships on campus and throughout the community.

Secondly, the possessor of personal power has a long record of production. Assignments have been carried out cheerfully, with distinction, and with a flair for making the service memorable, at least to someone.

Finally, but not the least in terms of importance, the possessor of personal power has this power because he or she understands how power works on the campus. The possessor keeps informed on who is deciding what and why. He or she knows the intricacies of decision-making, including influence networks and how reciprocity permeates these networks. In summary, the possessor of personal power acquires power through a series of constant contacts and sharing of information. Such contacts must occur among all segments of the University. To use the scarce commodity of time spinning webs of women's caucuses takes time away from the larger arena of contacts which accumulate to become personal power.

Let me re-visit Gordon and Ball's "Twenty strategies," reacting to each from a different point of view.

Strategy #1. *Find out who are responsible for Affirmative Action, EEO and Title IX on your campus. Invite them to lunch or a seminar with other campus women.*

Comment: The thought of "other campus women" brings two questions quickly to mind: 1) Are women so timid that they have to insulate themselves with an encirclement of other women? Further, there is the risk that the AA person will be able to remember, really remember, only two or three of the "campus women" who attend such a lunch. 2) Is it helpful to gang up on the AA person in this way or is it more helpful to learn about the AA officer as a real, honest-to-goodness person, (not as a writer of goals and a keeper of the tally) over an informal, get-acquainted lunch or cup of coffee?

Strategy #2. *Enroll in an assertiveness training group or organize one with other administrative and faculty women. Encourage female students and co-workers to participate in assertiveness training and consciousness raising.*

Comment: Assertiveness training is a current technique with which we have no quarrel. Such training is a self-help endeavor often leading to a more positive self-direction. What is bothersome is the admonition in the survival strategies that "faculty women" should organize these and "female students" should participate. This raises two questions. First, why can't *students* (of either sex) organize such sessions. And why can't males participate? Even some of those administrators at the top might enjoy a session or two to give them enhanced ability to deal with waiters who have tunnel vision or with anyone, for that matter, who has undergone assertiveness training and might have over-absorbed the message. To see this type of training as a female preserve closes off opportunities to work with campus males. Uncommitted time is a rare commodity. It needs to be shared with the University team, and the team has male members.

Strategy #3. *Keep yourself posted on professional vacancies on your campus; share this information with other women in your institution as well as at other schools.*

Comment: To keep posted on all kinds of information at any University is a splendid idea. It's a splendid idea to share the information too. This means sharing it with a well-qualified male as well. Reciprocity has a lot to do with how the world turns. If we help an able male today, he'll be bound by the norms to return the favor when he learns of an exciting opening that might be made to order for us.

Strategy #4. *Give your dean or department head a list of the names and addresses of the women's caucuses within your professional associations. Then follow up when vacancies arise to see that he or she uses it.*

Comment: It has to be recognized that the state of the art of women is going through a time when women caucuses are a part of most professional organizations. For deans and department heads to know this is an integral part of the situation. Hopefully, the day will come when caucuses within professional organizations can be drawn up on lines other than sex lines, the day when mixed-sex memberships can strive for something more discipline-related.

Strategy #5. *Join professional organizations and actively participate (hold offices, serve on committees, write articles, develop workshops, attend meetings, volunteer!).*

Comment: Of the entire twenty strategies on the list, this one makes the most sense. It makes sense for men and women alike. To be active in all sectors of one's profession is really what it's all about. There is one caveat about volunteering. Volunteer because we are needed and because we can do the job, not because we want to "make certain there is a woman on this assignment" or because "a woman has never been on this assignment before and someone has to prove it can be done."

Strategy #6. *Join professional organizations whose primary membership is women in administrative roles (such as the National Association for Women Deans,*

Administrators, and Counselors, or the National Council of Administrative Women in Education).

Comment: What can we say in a journal which is published by one such organization. Well, we can say that we agree whole-heartedly with the strategy. Provided, that is, that we join other organizations, too. Joining organizations with male members means we have that many more opportunities to meet people who will remember us when a likely position opens up. If we spend all our time with women's organizations we may find that we have only women to call upon when letters of recommendation are requested. Do we want to look like we don't know any men well enough to ask them to be a reference?

Strategy #7. *Establish ties with community women's organizations (like NOW, AAUW, League of Women Voters, BPW, and women's centers).*

Comment: Ditto the comments made in #6. And then let's take it one step further. Service on community agencies and boards builds an effective link between the university and the community. It's worth doing even when you don't have your sights set on the hierarchial heights. But if you do, some community friends might have other University friends and a good word from one link of the Community/University chain to another could be helpful.

Strategy #8. *Involve yourself in your campus Commission for Women (you need not be a member to attend open meetings, request minutes, express an interest, or respond to an issue).*

Comment: This strategy forces us to deal with the crux of the matter. That is, does the Commission for Women meet a continuing need on the campus or does it band together in distaff isolation the very people who need to be spending all their time in developing contacts with the "decision-making" men? It would be silly to call for a Commission for Non-Women but it makes about as much sense. Of course we are women and that fact is apparent to everyone. What makes us doubt the value of Commissions, our experience tells us, is that many such bodies have gone wildly from the feminist fort to the liberated front only to be accused of making the effort for the feminist cause rather than for the enhancement of higher education.

Strategy #9. *Go to your chancellor, provost or president and express your desire to serve on university committees and/or special projects.*

Comment: It's always nice to visit these people. It's always nice to let them know you are willing to serve on committees. But if personal power is the name of the game then our visit and our statement of our willingness to serve should be the second phase of the strategy. The first phase is the critical one. In the first phase a good friend of ours, who has the chancellor's (or provost's or president's) ear, indicates that we are the one for the committee or the project. Phase one of this strategy is synergistically more effective if two people indicate to top administration that we are ideally suited for this committee or project. Even more synergism can be built into the strategy if the two recommendations come from diverse points on the campus, or one is made from the campus and one from the community.

Strategy #10. *Establish a women's caucus on your campus. Intra-institutional communication is important, but also spend time analyzing the power structure and decision making practices at your university.*

Comment: Ditto comments made in #8. All of us can agree that intra-institutional communication is important. Further, all of us can agree that analyzing the power structure and decision-making practices is a worthy activity, an endlessly fascinating topic for any day of the week. It is the word "organize" in this strategy which stirs a question because we are convinced that the most productive power structure analysis is done informally, ideally in a warm and social way. Lunchtime is one time, the attitude adjustment hour is even better. Women can do it, men can do it, either sex can do it in groups, both sexes can do it in groups. That's the nice part about analyzing power structures and decision-making practices. It's an open sport. Anyone can play. To play all alone, as women, misses some of the fun, and probably lots of important bits of intelligence which can shed light on the population of the power structure and the decision-making processes of the University.

Strategy #11. *Find out who new female staff members are each fall and invite them to a women's caucus gathering.*

Comment: And while you are about it, find out who new male staff members are each fall and invite them to a gathering of any kind. It's great to meet new people and new men want to be on the team too.

Strategy #12. *Give credit where credit is due, and give support to women in your institution who are challenging the system (headway they make will be your gain also).*

Comment: Men like credit too. They will remember that you were one of those who took time to note one of their specific accomplishments.

Strategy #13. *Blow your own horn to your supervisors — let them know the worthwhile things you are doing and the positive image you are projecting for your division.*

Comment: A gentle hum is better than a big blow anytime. Learn to cite your accomplishments through a broker. Your networks of mixed-sex friends will accomplish a gale on your behalf. Especially if you accomplish a gale on their behalf.

Strategy #14. *Support male colleagues who are attempting to promote opportunities for women.*

Comment: Yes, by all means. Support male colleagues even when they are not engaged in promoting opportunities for women.

Strategy #15. *Analyze your own working practices with clerical staff to insure that you are not practicing those things you find dehumanizing in the main administrative structure.*

Comment: The strategy of analyzing one's working practices is good administrative procedure whether or not one is looking for things "dehumanizing." I consider this to be a helpful hint from the authors and am appreciative.

Strategy #16. *Work with the College of Education to provide beneficial practicum experiences for graduate women. (Share strategies as well as experiences, and failures as well as successes.) Be open to learn from your students.*

Comment: Is it not possible that graduate men would benefit from practicum experiences? We feel we would not be adverse to receiving feedback from a male student when a practicum we had helped to arrange was a highlight of his graduate experience.

Strategy #17. *Share the power — delegate responsibility and involve people in the decision making process; keep them informed of all the information that is needed to make a decision.*

Comment: Right on! I like this strategy. I think it works. In this strategy there is no mention that one sex is targeted, nor is there the implicit notion that "men will do wrong unless we women are there to keep them honest and straighten them out."

Strategy #18.. *Find out when budget planning begins and ask to be included. Attend open hearings on the budget.*

Comment: Why not? This strategy makes sense, too. Partly because it is not sex-selective, but more because of our conviction that the budget is like the spinal column of a University. It is a pretty important part of that anatomy, without which we could not stand.

Strategy #19. *Be aware of your usage of the generic "he" and begin to change both your writing and speaking to reflect "she/he."*

Comment: This Pronoun Preoccupation is related to the state of the art of the Women's Movement. The he/she or she/he craze might pass or it might not. One must make a personal choice regarding pronoun usage. For me the use of straightforward language which communicates meaning effectively and efficiently is the test. If the pronoun usage helps to do this then it is okay with me. If it doesn't, then let's not get too tangled up with sheeze and heeze.

Strategy #20. *Discuss salary review. Open discussion of salaries is one way to determine whether women are being treated equitably.*

Comment: Salaries and the revelation of exact amounts thereof is a topic guaranteed to be swirling in controversy. Such a strategy needs to be tempered with good judgment. Perhaps on this topic, more than any other, it is wise to apply your most practical knowledge of the power structure and the decision-making practices of the University. Then take a position evolved from careful consideration which you can back with carefully marshalled facts and a depth of understanding.

References

Bennett, S.M., Hopkins, J.H., Rohaly, K., and Walker, W.E. Educating today's women: Differing perceptions on educational programming. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1979, **45**(2), 37-44.

Drucker, P.F. *The effective executive*. New York, Harper and Row, 1967.

Gordon, R.S. & Ball, P.G. Survival dynamics for women in educational administration. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1977, **40**(2), 46-48.

Minuchin, P. The schooling of tomorrow's women. *School Review*, February, 1942, 199-208.

22 Minding Our "P's and Q's": Notes for Women in Higher Education Administration

STEPHANIE M. BENNETT

Among educational administrators women are still a minority. They face the same dilemmas, raise the same questions, and confront the same issues as their male counterparts. However, because fewer women are in administrative positions they often perceive themselves to be isolated and to lack access to the supportive framework so critical to professional growth. The discussion which follows examines the position of women in higher education administration. The figures present hard realities and caution against unfounded optimism. Many of the issues confronting female academic administrators are similar to, if not parallel with, the concerns of women in any management position. Because of this comparability, and because most recent publications focus on women in corporate managerial positions, the comments addressed specifically to women administrators are prefaced by a discussion of the more general literature.

A 1976 study of women in higher education administration indicated that only 16% of the key administrative positions in 1,037 institutions were held by women. And, it further indicated that these women's salaries were approximately four-fifths of those of their male counterparts. In private higher education the proportion of women administrators was somewhat higher: 21%, compared to 12% in public colleges. The highest percentage (56%) of women administrators was found, as one might expect, in private women's colleges (Van Alstyne and Withers, 1977). In 1970 Ruth Oltman published a study which detailed the small number of women in administrative positions. She found that even in women's colleges where administrative opportunities for women should be both expected and found, there was a higher than anticipated percentage of males in policy making positions (Oltman, 1970).

The profile for women college and university presidents is even less encouraging. Of the 2,926 institutions surveyed in 1976, only 154 or fewer than 5% were headed by women; 69% of these institutions were church related and 63% had fewer than a thousand students. Women served as presidents of only 16 public coeducational institutions (Taylor & Shavlik, 1977b).

Dr. Bennett is dean, Westhampton College, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia.

Lest we begin to believe these figures and percentages represent gains for women in the past decade or so, we should remind ourselves of a little history. While the entry of women into the mainstream of American higher education lagged considerably behind that of men — 200 years lapsed between the founding of Harvard in 1636 and Oberlin College's admission of women in 1837 — economic factors conspired at critical points in history to force women into the system. Shrinking enrollments and scarcity of resources during the Civil War opened many educational doors to women. Similarly, the depressed economy of the 1880s assisted women's entry into doctoral programs, especially when financial assistance or future endowments were tied to women's participation in educational programs.

Women's role in higher education has fluctuated in the twentieth century. By 1929, two-fifths of the bachelor's degrees and 17% of the doctorates awarded went to women. Between 1930 and the late 1940s, 27% of full-time faculty members were women. After 1949, the percentage declined steadily: in 1949-50 women consitituted 24.5% of full-time faculties, and in 1959-60, 22%. In 1976 the percentage had risen slightly to 24.2%. Since it is still largely from the faculty that administrators are chosen, we cannot be too encouraged that we are, as far as women faculty are concerned, still trying to catch up with where we were in 1930.

Notes on the Literature

Women in academic administration, like women pursuing management careers in corporate environments, must learn and develop basic survival and advancement skills. A number of books have been published recently which speak to these issues. Some emphasize the necessity for women to understand the language, environment, and political realities of management. Some present and outline strategies to assist women in achieving success. For example, one book identifies the "vital skills for upward mobility" as planning, coordinating, delegating, evaluating, problem solving and decision making, allocating time, training and guiding. Another offers these guidelines: establish priorities, be assertive, speak up, take risks, maintain career visibility, focus on the relevant, accept responsibility for actions, learn to live with trial and error, be patient, be strong, look out for yourself, and help other women (Hennig & Jardim, 1976; Harragan, 1977; Williams, 1977; Stewart, 1978).

Not all of the recent resources developed for women are as specific nor as direct as those mentioned above. In the past several years the popular book market has been inundated with "how-to" books and manuals which promise the reader if not instant, at least rapid, success in a variety of fields. Most of the books are addressed to those who wish to advance in a professional capacity and range in subject matter from "how-to" dress for success to "how-to" gain power. With the increasing focus upon women in the work force, many such resources are addressed specifically to them.

A number of these books designed for female readers are primarily cosmetic in their approach and offer simple techniques to aid women in altering external aspects of behavior or appearance so they might find more immediate acceptability in a male dominated business/professional environment. A small number attempt to incorporate a broad understanding of

women's place in society with the specific hints and suggestions. Few such books present hard data and careful analysis of the psycho/social environments which determine women's place in the professional world. This more serious, and more difficult, task has been left to scholarly journals, as perhaps it should have been.

Certain books explore methodology concurrent with self-help that will increase self-awareness and self-recognition, claiming to assist the reader in finding out "what you want and how to get it" (Newman & Berkowitz, 1977). Some purport to offer advice from an internal-corporate vantage point. Strong emphasis on the mythology of the female executive and advice on grooming, tips on maintaining femininity, and suggestions about appropriate conversation and behavior detract from the interpretation of data. The emphasis is often on the cosmetic, on the importance of dress and nonthreatening femininity, rather than on the preparation and skills needed for managerial advancement. Others incorporate suggestions for ambitious working women and discuss the problems women encounter — obtaining jobs initially, moving to better and better paying jobs, deflecting and defusing discriminatory attitudes. Often advice from successful women is included (Lynch, 1973; Bird, 1973).

What these and many other resources do is to, in large part, oversimplify the status of women in the work force. If there are female deficits resulting from socialization, they cannot be equalized by a cosmetic approach. The successful woman, or man for that matter, does not achieve that success solely by engaging in bright repartee, wearing "the" business uniform, or by following other similarly simplistic guidelines (women: don't put pictures of your family in your office; do mention your husband to counteract charges of lesbianism; don't decorate your office with plants; do find an alternative to carrying a purse).

Perhaps the most extensive body of new literature is that which strikes a pragmatic note. Often these resources move beyond the general or the cosmetic and concentrate on specific skills which can assist women as they enter or persevere in the world of work. The importance of developing assertive social and professional behavior figures prominently in many resources. The ability to recognize male and female attitudes toward women in the work force is often seen as a prerequisite to fostering such specific developmental tasks as job hunting and professional peer relationships. There is general consensus on the critical importance of addressing and developing such skills as time management, problem solving, effective speaking and writing, and decision making. (Higginson & Quick, 1975; Gambriil & Richey, 1976; Jackson & Mayleas, 1978; Irish, 1978). Methodology and format vary widely in these resources: some writers rely on particular training models such as transactional analysis, assertiveness training, and values clarification; others utilize a workbook format and provide exercises for self-instruction (Bloom, Coburn, & Pearlman, 1975; Scholz, Prince, & Miller, 1975; Jongeward & Scott, 1976).

The most comprehensive of these books span the gap between the cosmetic approach and the theoretical or analytical study of the socialization of women. They explore just where women do have options and offer a balanced presentation of context setting information and practical advice.

Topics range from handling sexism to information and guidance on women's health, financial management, retirement, and legal aspects of women's employment. Some of the most innovative and most useful information in these resources is that which describes opportunities in a variety of job and professional fields; lists feminist counseling resources; and identifies employment assistance agencies and career organizations (Pogrebin, 1975; Rennie & Grimstad, 1975; Loring & Otto, 1976).

These resources are extremely valuable for women deciding upon or changing career plans: they are specific, directive, informative, and provide a basis for positive action. They are, also, transitional; they provide a linkage between the awareness that many women develop about their personal roles and lives and a comprehensive view of working women in our society. For women, they ease entry into career and professional status and provide substantive, usable skills development guidelines.

Women in higher education administration — academic managers of economic resources, personnel, programs, and marketing campaigns — face fundamentally the same challenges as women in corporate management positions. Yet, similar as the situations may be and similar as the cultural experiences of the women may be, the business and academic environments are sufficiently different that we need to view our circumstances independently of the corporate world. Women in academic administration have not received the same public attention recently awarded by book publishers to the general field of women in management. The information about and for women in academic administration is found primarily in scholarly journals and doctoral research projects. The presentation which follows correlates the information so that it is accessible to a wider reading audience.

Minding Our "P's & Q's"

Recently, I participated in Virginia's first statewide meeting of women administrators. The day long session was devoted to presentations and discussions of important issues for women in academic administration. During the day one presenter — Elaine Rothenberg, Dean of the School of Social Work at Virginia Commonwealth University — was charged with the responsibility of "floating" among the series of discussion groups, gathering and synthesizing ideas, and presenting her analysis in a focusing session. Her summation inspired the title of this paper, "Minding Our P's and Q's," and the general outline for presenting an overview of the literature on women in higher education administration. She identified several "P's": purpose, power, people, perseverance, politics, and paranoia. As I drove home from the conference, I added a few of my own: potential, positions, planning and preparation, positives, and the idea of the poetic and prosaic. The "Q's" were a list slower in coming: questions, quantity, qualifications, quality, quotas.

The "P's"

Purpose: As a group, women administrators must be more self-conscious about developing a sense of purpose, a sense of urgency and commitment about expanding the corps of women in policy-making positions. They must avoid the tendency to focus upon the particular situation and ignore the potential of the network. We must hold in common the purpose of increasing

"both the number and the proportion of women administrators in higher education . . . " (Taylor & Shavlik, 1977b).

Power: Susan Kaufman, in the November 30, 1970, *Chronicle of Higher Education* concluded, "Few Women get Positions of Power in Academe . . . ." This we know. We also know that power is a problem women must come to grips with. Women are often tied up in the "nice girls aren't" and "nice girls don't" syndrome. Women must not only covet power: they must develop confidence in its use, they must stop apologizing for having it, they must learn its subleties (Peterson, 1975). And, women must be watchful and observe how men use power, not only for their own advancement, but against women.

People: Literature concerning women in educational administration focuses upon the question of people in two ways. The first focus relies heavily upon transforming a role which is part myth and part socialization into a significant administrative skill: an interest in others, a caring about other people. Nurturance *is* a great skill if used correctly. The nurturant administrator not only knows the kind of people by whom she is surrounded, but she also knows how caring about others will advance her professional, as well as her personal, cause.

The second focus upon people is the concept of network. Pioneering work in support systems and networks for women in higher education administration is being conducted by the Office for Women in Higher Education. At the institutional, the state, regional and national levels women must be supportive of other women yet realistic in their appraisals and their expectations. (Berry & Kushner, 1975; Taylor & Shavlik, 1977b).

Politics: Politics is not a dirty word. It is the reality of any complex organizational structure; it requires the administrator to ask, "what is really going on around me? do I understand it? how can I use it to advance my program or my own professional growth?" (Kantor & Wheatley, 1978; Gruenfeld, 1975; Hays, 1978).

Paranoia: A bumper sticker which gained popularity a year or so read: "Just because everybody is out to get me doesn't mean I'm paranoid." For some women administrators that sticker is quite appropriate. Working day after day as the only female in an administrative hierarchy produces unanticipated stress and sometimes leads to feelings of paranoia. Paranoia is nearly always destructive; it should be distinguished from good, healthy suspicion which can be very constructive. The woman administrator should remain vigilant, but shouldn't allow paranoia to intrude between herself and a larger purpose. (Atherton, 1938; Schetlin, 1975; Simpson, 1970; Van Meir, 1975; Dinsmore, 1970).

Potential: The issue of potential has two prongs: the individual woman's potential for growth; the potential for higher education of a great resource of available administrative talents. A recurrent theme here is the failure of institutions to recognize either of these kinds of potential: "No qualified women applied." (Furniss & Graham, 1974; Gillies, 1975; Mednick, 1975; *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education*, 1973; Rossi and Colderwood, 1973).

Positions: The condition of higher education in the last quarter of the twentieth century will be, by optimistic accounts, a static one; by conservative accounts, one of retrenchment. According to one observer of higher education, two identifiable developments will impact on women's access to positions: 1) it will be a no-growth situation in terms of number of students and in availability of financial resources; 2) forces external to the institution — federal legislation, Affirmative Action, Title IX, Unionization — will increasingly dictate institutional direction (McBee, 1975). As a result, mobility will be significantly decreased. Administrative mobility as we have known it will also be affected but perhaps not as significantly as some assume. Between 300 and 350 presidencies alone open up and change hands each year. The positions, then, are there and women must apply for and aggressively pursue them. Women must not be satisfied only with low power, low prestige posts; simultaneously they also must not overlook those positions which offer the opportunity to learn and grow (Tidball, 1973, 1976; Taylor & Shavlik, 1977b; Kahn, 1971; "No Room At the Top," 1977).

Planning and Preparation: It is difficult to overstate the critical nature of both planning and preparation. Careers, in any field, usually do not just happen. They are less likely to do so in the environment projected for higher education in the next twenty-five years. Women need to think "career," not job, if they wish to advance in higher education administration. Further, women should be aware of which preparation is necessary and which is not; too many women do not believe they are ready for a particular position. Valuable time, women's valuable time, is lost while they take one more course or attend one more seminar or workshop (Costick, 1978; Kantor & Wheatley, 1978; Oates & Williamson, 1978).

Performance: It may not be true today as it was in days past that a woman must be twice as good as a man and work twice as hard as he does to succeed. Whatever the equation, there is no doubt that performance is the denominator. Women administrators must perform not merely creditably but very well indeed. For many women, caught in the conflict of dual roles, this means single-mindedness which is often hard to achieve and which is often achieved at considerable sacrifice. (Reeves, 1975). Performance brings to mind another "P," *perseverance*. To succeed, women must be stubborn and determined; they must decide to be successful and pursue success with dedication.

Positives: Much of what has been summarized here is provocative; to some, portions may be discouraging, tiring or frustrating. Yet we are fortunate: we can glance around and find evidence of progress and positive commitment on many fronts. The Office of Women in Higher Education at the American Council on Education has created a far reaching and powerful support network for women administrators; the Bryn Mawr/HERS Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration offers growth opportunities for current and potential women administrators; The Project on the Status and Education of Women sponsored by the Association of American Colleges supports women in all phases of academic life; the professional literature is rich indeed and growing richer all the time. There are positives and we must keep them in the forefront.

The "Q's"

The "Q's" we must mind are not so numerous as the "P's" but are equally vital to our progress. Of all the "Q's" we should focus upon, *Questioning* is foremost: Women must question other administrators to gain information and knowledge; they must question to gain skills. The strong and silent image may pass for knowledge in some arenas, but not in administrative forums. Women must, more importantly, question themselves. What do I want? How can I get it? Who can assist me? What have my attitudes toward other women typically been and are they in women's best interest? (Tibbitts, 1975).

Qualifications: The literature is rich in attempts to isolate and identify the special and unique qualities found in the women who hold positions of influence and power in educational administration. Yet, there is really no single profile, no specific route, no one set of characteristics which can be identified as requisite for successful pursuit of administrative positions by women. Generally, the literature in this area highlights sets of characteristics: autobiographical, educational, professional responsibilities, or ambitions. While such data provide valuable insights, women must remember to focus upon their own qualifications and try not to pattern themselves after a composite profile. The term "qualifications" holds another critical reminder for women: they are qualified and other women, too, are qualified for high level administrative posts. Women must become knowledgeable about other women to counter the often heard statement "There aren't any qualified women in . . ." (Goerss, 1975; Fecher, 1972; Astin & Bayer, 1972; Cunningham, 1970; Ginzberg & Yohalem, 1966; Ginzberg, Berg, *et al*, 1966).

An interesting story is told about the origin and meaning of the title phrase, "Minding Our P's and Q's." It originally read "minding your pints and quarts" and referred to pubs in the British countryside. Some people believe the phrase was coined with reference to, and as an admonition against, excessive consumption. For purposes of comparison, I prefer the alternative belief: local officials, in an effort to assure fairness and uniformity, often checked weights and measures to protect the customer. The pub keeper had to "mind his pints and quarts," he had to make sure they were uniform and provided fair measure. The "our" in the title becomes the composite of American higher education. We must all be vigilant to provide fair measure to insure that our resources of potential and quality are neither neglected nor wasted.

The topic of women in higher education administration brings to mind numerous opportunities for comparison. I'd like to offer a final one from the world of sports. When on a football field one member of one team commits a foul (or an illegal procedure) the entire team is penalized and the opposing team receives a temporary advantage. The advantage isn't permanent; it is just sufficient to allow the disadvantaged team — the team against which the foul was committed — the opportunity to regain parity and equality. If a penalty were not assessed the disadvantaged team would continue to play from an inferior position. It is possible to find a parallel between the disadvantaged team and women administrators. The latter — technically, legally, and institutionally speaking — are disadvantaged. We might say women

have been the victims of a foul, or an illegal procedure. Perhaps through awareness and effort, perhaps with the support of federal legislation and judicial action, women will receive, at the least, a temporary advantage, at the most, an equal opportunity. When they do receive advantage or parity, women must be prepared to accept the challenge with confidence.

References

Adler, N.E. Women and higher education: Some speculations on the future. *Signs*, Summer 1978, 912-915.

Alexander, S. Will power change women? *Newsweek*, April 1, 1974, 30.

Arter, M.H. The role of women in administration in state universities and land-grant colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.

Astin, H.S. and Bayer, A.E. Sex discrimination in academe. *Educational Record*, Spring 1972, 101-118.

Atherton, G.F. *Can women be gentlemen?* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938.

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration. *Education Digest*, 1959, **25**, 72-75.

Baumrind, D. From each according to her ability. *School Review*, 1972, **80**(2), 161-197.

Berry, J. & Kushner, R. A critical look at the queen bee syndrome. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1975, **38**(4), 173-178.

Bird, C. *Everything a woman needs to know to get paid what she's worth*. New York: McKay, 1973.

Burns, D.M. Women in education administration: A study of leadership in California public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964.

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration — Where will they go from here? *Educational Horizons*, 1959, **37**, 72-75.

Bloom, L.Z., Coburn, K., & Pearlman, J. *The new assertive woman*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1975.

Casazza, C.L. Career patterns of financial aids directory. Unpublished doctoral thesis, School of Education, Indiana University, 1970.

Cohen, A.C. Women in higher education: Recommendations for change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 1971, 164-167.

Costick, R.M. *Women in educational administration: Profiles and resources*. Washington, D.C.: Women's Educational Equity Communications Network, 1978.

Cunningham, M., Jr., Women who made it offer insights (some unintended) into their problems. *College and University Business*, February 1970, 56-61.

Davis, A.E. Women as a minority group in higher academics, in *The professional woman*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Dinsmore, D. Who's saying men are the enemy? Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: Know, Inc., 1970.

Elbe, L.E. Strengthening the position of women faculty members. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1972, **35**(4), 165.

Epstein, C.F. Structuring success for women: Guidelines for gatekeeprs. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1973, **37**(1), 35-36.

Fecher, A.R. *Career patterns of women in college and university administration*. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.

Fley, J. The time to be properly vicious. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*,1974, **37**(2), 53-58.

Furniss, W.T. & Graham, P.A. *Women in higher education administration*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1974.

Cambrill, E. and Richey, C. *it's up to you*. Millbrae, California: Les Femmes Publishing, 1976.

Gillies, J. In defense of the dean of women: A new role for a new world. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1975, **38**(4), 156-162.

Ginzberg, E., with Berg, E., others, *The life styles of educated women*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Ginzberg, E. and Yohalem, M., *Educated American women: Self portraits*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Goerss, K. *A study of personality factors of selected women administrators in higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1975.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? *Trans-Action*, April 1968, 28-30.

Gornick, V. Why Radcliffe women are afraid of success. *New York Times Magazine*, January 14, 1973, 10-11 ff.

Graham, P.A. Expansion and exclusion: A history of women in American higher education, *Signs*, Summer 1978, 759-773.

Gruenfeld, E.F. *Promotion: Practices, policies, and affirmative action*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Harragan, B.L. *Games mother never taught you*. New York: Rawson Associate Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Hawley, P. Perceptions of male models of feminity related to career choice, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1972, **19**(4), 308-313.

Hays, G.D., Strategies for advancing women in higher education administration. Paper presented to Bryn Mawr/HERS Summer Institute, July 1978, reprinted by Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. *The managerial woman*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Higginson, M.V. & Quick, T.L. *The ambitious woman's guide to a successful career*. New York: Amacon, 1975.

Holmstrom, L.L. Women's career patterns: Appearance and reality, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1973, **36**(2), 77-78.

Horner, M.S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Horner M.S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women, *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, **28**(2), 157-175.

Horner, M.S. Why bright women fail, *Psychology Today*, 1969, **3**(6).

Howell, M.C. Professional women and the feminist movement, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 1974, **37**(2), 84-87.

Irish, R.K. *Go hire yourself an employer*. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1978.

Jackson, T. & Mayleas, D. *The hidden job market*. New York: Times Publishing, 1978.

Jongeward, D. & Scott, D. *Women as winners*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1976.

Kahn, H. Women in the professions: Career considerations and job placement techniques, *Journal of Economic Issues*, September 1971, 28-45.

Kane, R. *Sex Discrimination in Education: A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel*. Vol. I. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, April 1976.

Kantor, R.M. & Wheatley, M.J. Women in academic administration: The role of training, summary of Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, distributed by Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1978.

Kaslow, F.W. & Schwartz, L.L. Self-Perceptions of the attractive, successful female professional, *Intellect*, February 1978, 313-315.

Kaufmann, S. Few women get positions of power in academe, survey discloses, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 30, 1970, 1ff.

Lewis, E.C. *Developing woman's potential*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1968.

Loring, R. and Otto, H.A. *New life options: The working woman's resource book*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

Lynch, E.M. *The executive suite — Feminine Style*. New York: Amacon, 1973.

McBee, M.L. A new day, *Journal of the National Association for Woman Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1975, **38**(4), 184-188.

McKee, J.P. & Sherriffs, A.C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts, *American Journal of Sociology*, 1959, **64**(4), 356-363.

Mednick, M.S. *et al.* (Eds.) *Women and achievement: Social and motivational analyses*. New York: Halstead Press, 1975.

Miller, J.B. & Mothner, I. Psychological consequences of sexual inequality, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1971, **41**(5), 767-775.

Wanted: More women in educational leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.

Neidig, M.B. *Women applicants for administrative positions: Attitudes held by administrators and school boards*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973.

Newman, M. & Berkowitz, B. *How to take charge of your life*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1977.

No room at the top, *American Education*, June 1977, 20-46.

Norman, B. A study of women in leadership positions in North Carolina, *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 1970, **36**, 10-14.

Oates, M.J. & Williamson, S., Women's colleges and women achievers, *Signs*, Summer 1978, 795-806.

Oltman, R. *Campus 1970: Where do women stand?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, November 1970.

Opportunities for women in higher education. New York: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

Peterson, M. A woman administrator speaks: Openness and secrecy in education administration, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Spring 1975, **38**(3), 124-131.

Pogrebin, L.C. *Getting yours: How to make the system work for the working woman*. New York: David McKay Company, 1975.

Reeves, M.E. An analysis of job satisfaction of women administrators in higher education, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Spring 1975, **38**(3), 132-135.

Rennie, S. & Grimstad, K. *The new woman's survival sourcebook*. New York: Borzoi Books, 1975.

Rossi, A.S. & Calderwood, A. (Eds.). *Academic women on the move*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

Sandler, B. What women really want on the campus, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 24, 1972, 8.

Schetlin, E.M. Wonderland and looking-glass: Women in administration, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Spring 1975, **38**(3), 104-109.

Scholz, N.T., Prince, J.S., & Miller, G.P. *How to decide: A guide for women*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

Simpson, L.A. A myth is better than a miss: Men get the edge in academic employment, *College and University Business*, February 1970, 72-73.

Staines, G., Tavris, C. & Epstein-Jayaratne, T. The queen bee syndrome, *Psychology Today*, 1974, **7**(8), 55-60.

Stewart, N. *The effective woman manager*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Stiles, L.J. & Nystrand, P.M. The politics of sex in education, *The Educational Forum*, 1974, **38**(4), 431-440.

Sutherland, S.L. The unambitious female: Women's low professional aspirations, *Signs*, Summer 1978, 774-974.

Taylor, E. & Shavlik, D. Selecting professionals in higher education: A Title IX perspective. Washington: American Council on Education, 1977.

Taylor, E. & Shavlik, D. To advance women: A national identification program, *Educational Record*, Winter 1977, 93-99.

Taylor, H.A. Women in administration, in N.C. Nolte, (Ed.). *An introduction to school administration*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Taylor, S. Educational leadership: A male domain? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1973, **55**, 124-128.

Tibbitts, S.L. Sex role stereotyping: Why women discriminate against themselves, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1975, **38**(4), 177-183.

Tidball, M.E. Perspective on academic women and affirmative action, *Educational Record*, Spring 1973, 130-135.

Tidball, M.E. On liberation and competence, *Educational Record*, Spring 1976, 101-110.

Van Alstyne, C. & Withers, J.S. *Women and minorities in higher education administration*. Washington: College and University Personnel Administration, 1977.

Van Meir, E.J. Sexual discrimination in school administration opportunities, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, Summer 1975, **38**(4), 163-167.

Vetter, B.M. & Babco, E.L. *Professional women and minorities*. Washington: Scientific Manpower Comission, 1976.

Westervelt, E.M. & Fixter, D.A. with assistance of M. Comstock. *Women's higher education and continuing education: An annotated bibliography with selected references on related aspects of women's lives*. Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

Wolman, C. & Frank, H. No place for a woman, *Behavior Today*, 1972, **3**(48), 2.

Williams, M.G. *The new executive woman*. Radnor, Pennsylvania: Chilton Book Co., 1977.

23 Observations on . . . Women in Higher Education Administration

BETTE J. SOLDWEDEL

While I have never professed to be a visionary, I welcome the opportunity to comment on the future of women in higher education administration because I am hopeful and optimistic. My hope and optimism are based on the assumption that women will have *learned* from the past and will use those learnings to make progress in the decades ahead.

Learning #1: To be competent is not enough! Some women expect "the system" to function in a rational and orderly progression: they are well trained, they are diligent, their talents and contributions will be recognized, they will be promoted to increasingly more sophisticated, rewarding, prestigious positions in higher education administration. "The system" appears to work to the point just below promotion to highest levels of administrative decision-making. The proportion of well-qualified, competent women administrators who eventually are accorded positions as presidents, chancellors, chief student personnel administrators, chief academic administrators is minute in comparison to the numbers of qualified, competent women who are available for executive leadership.

Learning #2: Civil rights legislation and governmental directives do not automatically open doors. Campus administration, for the most part, is a patriarchy dominated by leaders who do not necessarily take seriously the notion of a professional partnership with women colleagues. Without effective enforcement and in the absence of careful surveillance by boards of trustees or state legislatures, Title IX guidelines merely provide vehicles to legitimize the nonselection of women for faculty and administrative appointments. Delicately conceived "searches," duly advertised in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, give proper consideration to female applicants in the pool but too often continue to result in the employment of the uniquely qualified male.

Dr. Soldwedel is professor of education and chair, Division of Studies in Education, University of North Florida. She is the immediate past-president of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Learning #3: Women are their own worst enemies. Too many women undersell themselves, think they are lucky to hold the jobs they do, and are willing to settle for less than a position which commands their full potential. They are literally grateful for small favors. They give in to the system. At the same time, other women who have "made it" on their own do not understand or care to understand that opportunities which they had are not always available to women today. Still others enjoy the status of Lone Star or Token. Some hesitate to use the collective strength of women united in a common purpose and seem to be embarrassed by association with women's groups. Many are professionally seduced by fringe relationships with the Old Boys' network and interpret congeniality and cajolary as progress, only to find that employment levels and position classifications change not one iota over time.

Learning #4: Colleges and universities today are crippled imitations of another age in American education. Two decades of equivocation on life values have surely produced a generation of confused young adults. Administrative styles very often have been designed merely to keep the peace and the enrollment. Counseling philosophies, translated into administrative actions and relationships, tell the young that administrators must be careful not to provide solutions to problems or to promulgate standards lest we stifle their innate creativity and intrude on their rights. The coeducational dormitory and unlimited visitation stand as monuments to that mentality.

In the face of such negativism, why hope and optimism? Because women have always been superior and sensitive learners, and the lessons learned provide unmistakable guidance and challenge for the future. You might assess your future in higher education administration by responding to six questions:

- Do you have a strong "sense of self"?
- Do you have a realistic career development plan?
- Do you have a drive to achieve?
- Do you understand and thrive on politics?
- Are you willing to be an activist?
- Are you willing to provide new ethical and moral leadership?

Do you have a strong "sense of self"?

Women must believe it is as natural for women as for men to aspire, to hold highest professional goals, to expect to be a president, a chancellor, a top level administrator. Even though the socialization process may teach little girls to act out roles as passive followers, as handmaidens, women must know and internalize that they are equal.

Women must be confident of themselves, never doubting that they do have the knowledge, skills, and capacity to compete. While there are occupations in which women are inferior as performers, those jobs involve only the muscles and not the brain. Higher education administration is not a muscle-bound occupation.

Do you have a realistic career development plan?

Women must articulate clear-cut career goals and develop two sets of strategies for their accomplishment. One set of strategies should be based on

a model of professional progression: what the individual must do to equip herself with the competencies necessary for next level careers. A second set of strategies should address day-to-day survival: what the individual must do to live within the present system.

Attainment of career goals involves both preparation and performance. Very likely women will continue to have to be better prepared than men to be selected for a given position. At the same time, women will have to demonstrate that they can manage themselves and their programs well in order to establish themselves as potential leaders.

Do you have the drive to achieve?

It is easy to become discouraged when recognition for one's talents is not forthcoming or when demeaning sexist slights occur. Women committed to their goals, women who are determined and persevering will find that these compelling forces are effective self-protection.

The sheer will to achieve, to excel, along with the technical competence to do the job, are essential qualities to surmount psychological abuse.

Do you understand and thrive on politics?

Politics determines who is called. Politics determines who serves. Politics determines who succeeds and survives. Top leaders in higher education administration appear to be drawn from three groups: (1) Recognized authorities: those who have been able to achieve because of their scholarship contributions and/or their special expertise; (2) Personalities: those who rise because they have combined skill and competence with charm and persuasiveness; (3) Performers: those who are competent pluggers, willing to take on nearly any task and to see it through to completion. But, the reason for their choice as leaders in higher education administration may be entirely irrelevant to their ability to succeed and survive. It is the ability to manage people, from students to trustees and legislators, the ability to deal effectively with diverse and sometimes incompatible constituencies, the ability to act purposefully and make macro decisions acceptable to each microcosm that determine the fate of administrators. For all of the textbooks written on administrative theory in education, none would be as useful as a version of a Theodore White book: *The Making of a* **Campus** *President.*

Are you willing to be an activist?

Few top level administrators in higher education, male or female, are discovered by accident. They make known their abilities; they "show-case" their talents; they are positive about themselves in appearance and in action. Some women find it easier to "hang back." To progress in higher education administration, women must be activists in their own behalf.

As one considers the status of women in general, women also must be rallied to monitor and critique the effectiveness of campus affirmative action/equal employment opportunity programs. An Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, beholden to the administration for that position, is hardly in a potent position to effect significant change if the supervisor approves the status quo. As women come to recognize the power of unity, as they seek and gain the support of other men and women in behalf of fairness and equity, affirmative action will become a reality.

Are you willing to provide new ethical and moral leadership?

Unless higher education is to abandon altogether its historic role as society's standardbearer, new leadership is required to attend to the character development of the young. It is a role well suited to women. The men have presided over the debilitating erosion of ethical standards and moral values for decades. Why not now female leadership? Let women administrators take the leadership to provide students with experiences that make meaningful such concepts and terms as personal integrity, standards of excellence, honesty, responsibility.

To believe in one's self, to set professional goals commensurate with one's talents, to strive for those goals with determination and perseverance, to be willing to learn the politics of leadership, to be an activist in behalf of one's self and others, to commit one's self to character development of the generations of students to come: those are the challenges facing women in higher education administration. I remain optimistic and full of hope.

24 How Do Women Administrators View Job Satisfaction and Discrimination?

JUDITH COCHRAN

During the spring of 1976, 207 Texas, Florida, and Washington women who received supervision credentials in 1975 were surveyed. Names were obtained from the educational institutions graduating the largest number of higher education administrators according to the state certification agencies. A questionnaire, investigating job satisfaction, career expectations, and demographic data, was sent to known addresses. There were 105 usable returns.

The average female administrator in this study worked in a city of over 100,000 and had supervision responsibilities for more than 21 people. She was over 40 years old, married, and earned from $15,000 to $20,000.

The responses, although small in number, suggest trends in job satisfaction and discrimination as perceived by the subjects. The study was intended as a comparison between those women who obtained administrator credentials in 1969-1970 and those who obtained administrator credentials in 1975-1976. The population available from 1969-1970 was so small the research had to be revised to include additional females from Florida, Washington, and Texas.

One hypotheses of the study was that female principals and assistant principals would perceive themselves as not experiencing discrimination.

The data indicate that women in administration do not view themselves as objects of discrimination (Table 1). Many interpretations are possible. In Texas, 59% of the women obtaining the administrator's certificate already held positions in which the credential enhanced or enabled retention of current jobs. These women did not have to search for employment after receiving degrees. A second interpretation might be that desensitization to discrimination of female administrators has occurred. According to one respondent, it was neither personally nor professionally productive to be aware of or react to discriminatory situation.

A third interpretation would be that these women are indeed exceptional. H.E.W. statistics of 1973 indicate 49% of secondary teachers were women while only 1.4% of high school principals were women. Those women then

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Winter, 1978), pp. 67-68. Dr. Cochran is assistant professor in the College of Education at North Texas State University, Denton.

who are employed in administrative positions are possibly outstanding and treated accordingly.

Table 1:
Have you ever felt you were discriminated against in employment as a woman?

	Texas	*Florida*	*Washington*
Yes	21%	35%	29%
No	76	64	58
Uncertain	3	1	13

In addition, most women surveyed did not perceive themselves as being discriminated against in the delegation of work.

From an examination of Table 2, it becomes apparent many women perceived themselves as working no harder than men. "There is a job to be done and it is my job to do it regardless of how much work that entails." Those who believed they worked harder stated they did so to establish "visibility" and "credibility." Several made similar statements referring to "proving" themselves. The consistent reference to proving competency was interesting as adequate administrative training was controlled in the sample selection.

Although the majority of subjects did not experience discrimination, objective criteria might indicate differently. The ratio of women in administration from the pool of women teaching in secondary schools is not proportionate to the ratio for men. And research conducted by Barter (1959), Cobbly (1970), and LaBarthe (1973) found a strong bias against appointing women to administrative positions.

Table 2:
Do you feel you have to work harder than a man would in the same position?

	Texas	*Florida*	*Washington*
Yes	37%	50%	37%
No	60	30	63
Uncertain	3	20	0

Table 3:
How many increases in responsibility or title changes have you had in the last five years?

	Texas	*Florida*	*Washington*
0	24%	9%	17%
1	39	55	1
2	18	18	23
3	16	9	23
4	3	9	1
No response	0	0	35

Even after employment as administrators, advancement reflected a local responsiveness to promotion of women, as fostered by federal legislation and the women's movement. Texas women in this study had obtained fewer increases of responsibility or promotion in the last five years than women in Florida or Washington (Table 3). Since all subjects had received a degree within the past year and most had been employed in their current position prior to obtaining the credential, a larger percentage of promotions might have been expected.

Regardless of promotions or lack of them, women in administration expressed a high degree of job staisfaction. Eighty-seven percent saw their employers and co-workers as supportive. Relating well to people was listed as their strongest asset. And 82% stated self-fullfillment in their postion as their greatest reward. Research by Crosby (1973) also found a high degree of job satisfaction among women who had become superintendents. It would seem that female administrators enjoy their work and view themselves as effective in their positions.

If discrimination is defined in terms of equal representation, promotions, or quotas, then female administrators could be objects of discrimination. However, the responses of women in this study indicate women do not evaluate their success on such criteria. For them, relating well to people and self-fullment provide their greatest rewards. If discrimination is seen as a force denying personal power and frustrating those seeking job satisfaction, then women in administration do not qualify. They do not view themselves as thwarted, over worked, or ineffectual. The number of women in educational administration may be small, but those in the field tend to perceive their status in a more positive light than might be expected.

References

Barter, A.S. The status of women in school administration — where will they go from here? *Educational Horizons*, 1959, **37**, 72-75.

Cobbly, L. A study of attitudes and opportunities for women in six western states to become elementary school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, **31**, 4409A.

LaBarthe, E.R. A study of the motivation of women in administrative and supervisory positions in selected unified school districts in Southern California (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1973). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1974, **34**, 3695-96A.

25 Women Presidents: The First Fifty Years

JOSEPHINE JOHNSON and CHARLES R. O'BRIEN

Although a woman suffrage amendment to the *United States Constitution* had been presented to every Congress since 1878, it did not become a reality until August 26, 1920, when the Nineteenth Amendment was enacted. The enfranchisement came in sufficient time for women to vote in the 1920 election, but it failed to produce a large female vote. This legislation did, however, signal women's readiness to assume more responsibility both nationally and professionally. In 1921, the National Vocational Guidance Association elected its first woman president — Helen Bradford Thompson Woolley, a *summa cum laude* Ph.D. of the University of Chicago, a leader in the woman's suffrage movement and a well-known psychologist.

Despite this early evidence of female involvement, little substantive investigation of their unique backgrounds has been made. Increased space has been devoted in publications to the general subject of women, but professional groups have not attempted to examine in detail the personal, educational and professional environments of those women who have made significant contributions to their professional associations. Consequently, the writers thought it useful to explore the backgrounds of those women who have made significant contributions to their professional associations. The first fifty years — the period from 1921 to 1971 — seemed especially appropriate for review.

Method

A study was designed to collect, analyze and collate personal, educational and professional data about the thirty-four women who were elected to thirty-six presidential positions in the American Personnel and Guidance Association, its eight affiliate divisions and the constitutional predecessors of the current divisions. The American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), organized in 1952 as a consolidating organization, was preceded

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Summer, 1976), pp. 168-172. Dr. Johnson is associate professor, Department of Counselor Education, and is on the University Counseling Center staff at Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois. Dr. O'Brien is director of the University Counseling Center at the same institution.

by the American Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations (ACGPA), officially formed in 1934, and the Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations (CGPA), established in 1940.

The following associations, listed with their predecessors, were also reviewed.

1) The National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) was founded in 1913.

Table 1

Women Presidents of APGA and Its Divisions, 1921-1975

Professional Associations	1921-1971 Number	1972-1975 Number
APGA	1	2
Predecessors (ACGPA and CCPA)	8	
NVGA	13	1
ACPA	8	0
Predecessors (NAAS and NAPPO)	2	
SPATE	1	1
Predecessors (TCPA, AATC and AACTE)	0	
ASCA	2	2
ACES	0	0
ARCA	1	0
Predecessor (DRC)	0	
AMEG	0	1
NECA	0	0

2) The American College Personnel Association (ACPA), founded in 1931, was preceded by the National Association of Appointment Secretaries (NAAS), a group formed in 1924, and the National Association of Placement and Personnel Officers (NAPPO), the NAAS replacement in 1929.

3) In 1951, the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education (SPATE) was organized. It had been preceded by the Teachers' College Personnel Association (TCPA), organized in 1931, which was replaced by the Personnel Section of the American Association of Teacher's Colleges (AATC) in 1946 and the Personnel Section of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in 1948. (In 1975 the Division became the Association for Humanistic Education and Development.)

4) The American School Counselors Association (ASCA) was formed officially and became an affiliate of APGA in 1953.

5. In 1961, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision ACES) was formed; it was preceded by the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers (NAGSCT), named in 1949.

6) The American Rehabilitation Counselors Association (ARCA), established in 1962, originated from the Division of Rehabilitation Counseling (DRC), organized in 1958.

7) The Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance (AMEG) was formed in 1965.

8) The National Employment Counselors Association (NECA) became an official member of APGA in 1966.

Table 1 presents a summary of the professional leadership positions which were held by the thirty-four women who were the subjects of this study. The years 1921-1971 were the focus of attention, but the subsequent period was of interest also. A perusal of these more recent data for the divisions in the original study provides some indication of the continuing leadership role which women have assumed.

A review of the literature, the collection of data through questionnaires, personal communications with leaders and archival materials at the American Personnel and Guidance Association headquarters were the principal sources of information. Data also were collected from national and regional chronologies. For purposes of geographic discussion, the regions referred to correspond to those utilized by ACES: North Atlantic, North Central, Southern, Rocky Mountain and Western.

Findings

A summary of the data indicated some commonalities. No definitive profile became evident, but a description of the women who held positions of executive leadership in professional associations did emerge. This description is summarized in two categories — personal background information and educational and professional background information.

Personal Background Information

1) Birthplaces were identified for thirty-one of the thirty-four women leaders. Fourteen women were born in the North Atlantic region and eleven in the North Central region. Illinois and Pennsylvania were the individual states with the largest representation.

2) Fifty-nine percent of these women were born before 1900 and completed undergraduate education prior to World War I. They were doubtless influenced by the social reform movement which permeated higher education during those years.

3) Marital status did not appear to be a factor in the exercise of a professional leadership role. Some of the women were married at the time of their terms of office, and thirty-five percent were married for some period of their lives. Moreover, several of the single women had substantial family obligations (e.g., caring for aging parents or invalid relatives).

4) The probability of a woman being elected to a presidency prior to age forty seemed to be very limited; forty-four percent were over fifty when elected.

5) Women who were recognized leaders in professional associations also were active in other organizations and in community affairs. Many served as presidents of other groups as well.

Educational and Professional Background

1) Available data revealed that seventeen of the women resided in the North Atlantic region and nine in the North Central region at the time of election to presidential office. No woman president has been elected from the Rocky Mountain region.

2) Frequently, private institutions of higher education were the location for the training of women leaders. Sixty-three percent of the undergraduate degrees, sixty-nine percent of the master's degrees and fifty-three percent of the doctorates were awarded by private schools.

3) Fewer than half, forty-four percent, completed doctoral degrees. Sixty percent of the doctorates were awarded in the North Central region; The University of Chicago graduated four leaders. In contrast, only one female president received a doctorate from an institution in the Southern region, and no woman leader received a graduate degree from a college or university in the Rocky Mountain region.

4) The typical pattern of educational-vocational activity for these women was employment as a secondary school teacher following completion of a bachelor's degree, the possible combination of teaching-counseling services following completion of the master's degree and employment at the college and university level following completion of the doctorate.

5) Women employed by colleges and universities seemed to have a better possibility of being elected to a presidency than those employed in the elementary and secondary schools. The occupations of fifty-nine percent of the women leaders were associated with colleges and universities. Approximately twenty-nine percent were employed in elementary and secondary schools, with several positions being supervisory in nature. The other presidents were employed by state, federal and private agencies.

6) The majority of women presidents published articles and books during their professional careers. The number of publications ranged from "none listed" to "hundreds" of articles and to the authorship of books which, in some cases, numbered "at least fifteen."

7) Biographical information about women leaders appeared in seventeen nationally recognized chronologies, notably *American Women* and *Who's Who of American Women*. The chronologies *Who's Who in America* and *Who's Who in American Education* listed only five of the women.

In developing this project, the writers attempted to listen to the spirit of the times and to the attitudes which influenced the utilization of this dynamic human resource — women leaders. As a group, these women seemed to be unusually dedicated, tireless workers in the field of guidance. They were people who possessed sensitivity to the needs of their students and were cognizant of the sociological and psychological ramifications of the period. They truly seem to merit identification as pioneers in a new and emerging profession.

Challenge

But what of the present and the future? Why have some associations not included women in their presidential ranks? How can women in nonuniversity settings be encouraged to seek executive office? Why were the women

presidents more likely to be recognized in female rather than general chronologies? These and related questions need to be addressed.

Some regions which have a limited number of women leaders might evaluate their recruitment approaches for encouraging female participation in professional organizations. Divisions, through their publications and functioning, should provide greater recognition for the unique and significant contributions of their women leaders, past and present. In summary, professional groups need to examine the participation of their female members, and those members themselves must continue to explore their own attitudes toward leadership.

References

Daley, T.T. Life ain't been no crystal stair. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, February 1972, **50**, 491b.

Ginzberg, E. *Life styles of educated women*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Johnson, J. *Women leaders in national guidance and counseling associations: Some implications of their backgrounds and leadership roles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1972.

Sheeley, V.L., *Leaders in professional organizations in the guidance and associations: Some implications of their backgrounds and leadership roles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1972.

Sheeley, V.L., *Leaders in professional organizations in the guidance and counseling movement; some implications of their personal and professional backgrounds*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1968.

Siegel, A. 1921 to 1971: 50 years of the P&G. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, February 1972, **50**, 513-21.

26 The Profile and Status of N.A.W.D.A.C. Members, 1976

BETTE J. SOLDWEDEL

A survey of the N.A.W.D.A.C. membership was conducted in early 1976 with 1,259 individuals responding to questionnaires mailed to 2,300 members. The primary purposes of the survey were (1) to provide a profile of the current membership; (2) to identify ways in which members perceive the value of the Association; (3) to identify trends in the profile and status of members by comparing results with a similar survey conducted in 1970.[1]

In the report which follows, comparable data from the 1970 survey are reported in parentheses.

Demographic data. The 1976 survey indicates that 29% (25%) of the members of the Association are under 30; 37% (46%) are over 45; 34% (29%) are between 31 and 45 years of age.

Asked the number of years they had worked in educational administration, 67% (58%) indicated one to ten years; 19% (24%), from 11 to 20 years; 13% (17%), over twenty years.

Thirty-one percent (25%) had been in a field other than educational administration from one to five years; 40% (50%), 6 or more years; 7% (15%) indicated over 20 years.

Within the N.A.W.D.A.C. structure, 46% (46%) belong to the University section; 30% (31%) to the Senior College section; 11% (9%) to the Community and Junior College section; 6% (11%) to the High School section; 4% (2%) to the Elementary, Middle, and Junior High School section; 3% (2% Other) to the Continuing Education section.

Preparation. Doctoral degrees are held by 21% (14%) of the respondents; master's degrees by 70% (74%); bachelor's degrees by 7% (8%); professional diplomas, J.S., M.D., educational specialist, 2%.

Respondents to the survey identified 74 different fields of study for their highest degree. Twenty-four percent (30%) majored in guidance and counseling; 21% (24%) in student personnel administration; 7% (5%) in higher

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Summer, 1977), pp. 123-127. Dr. Soldwedel is professor of education and chair, Division of Studies in Education, University of North Florida, Jacksonville.

education administration; 9% (6%) in educational, social, clinical, or counseling psychology. Sixteen percent (10%) said their major field of study was another education subject, while 23% (15%) majored in a field outside of education. Among the most representative fields outside of education were English and English literature, 6%; history, 2%; sociology and anthropology, 2%.

Current work setting. Thirty-four percent (37%) of the respondents are employed at institutions enrolling 1,000 to 4,999 students. Seven percent (6%) are at institutions with more than 30,000 students, 3% (5%) at institutions enrolling fewer than 500. Fifty-seven percent are employed at public institutions, 43% at private schools.

Twenty-nine percent (23%) of the respondents are located in the Great Lakes regions; 24% (20%) are located in the Mid-Atlantic region; 18% (18%) Southeast; 9% (12%), Far West; 8% (8%), New England; 5% (7%), Southwest; 3% (4%), Rocky Mountain section; 4% (8%), Plains.

Work status. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents (55%) indicated they are the chief female officer at the institution, while 68% (71%) report to a male. Seventy-three percent (73%) say that the chief student personnel officer at their institution is a male.

While 69% (50%) do *not* hold faculty rank and 76% (59%) do *not* hold tenure, salary ranges reported are as follows:

	1970	1976
Under $5,000	5%	4%
$5,000-7,499	6	2
$7,500-9,999	22	6
$10,000-14,999	44	32
$15,000-19,999	17	28
$20,000 or above	3	24

Of those who hold faculty rank, 8.5% (14%) are professors; 24% (20%), associate professors; 34.5% (24%), assistant professors; 18.5% (26%), instructors; 14.5% (16%), general faculty or lecturers.

Respondents to the questionnaire indicated one of 125 different present job titles, the most frequent being Associate Dean of Students, 11%; Counselor, 11%; Dean of students, 8%; Assistant Dean of Students, 8%. Numerically, only 45 individuals (239) hold the title "Dean of Women." Twenty-eight percent of the respondents gave job titles other than those identified with student personnel work, guidance and counseling, residential life, and student activities. The membership respondents include 3 presidents, 25 vice presidents, 13 deans of faculties or of a college, 4 academic deans, 1 Assistant State Superintendent of Schools, and 1 Assistant Superintendent of Schools. Two hundred seven people hold the title "coordinator" or "director."

Occupational benefits. The job benefit available to the largest group of respondents is identified as "insurance," 80%. Percentages of those receiving benefits are as follows:

	1970	1976
Sabbaticals	24%	24%
Financial support to attend professional meetings	74	71
Adequate program budget	30	43
Maternity leave	12	46

Of those who receive maternity leave benefits, 42% receive pay while on leave; 58% do not receive pay. Sixty-five percent report that the institution contributes to retirement benefits; 75% have a private office; 39% have reserved parking.

Job satisfactions. Seventy percent (63%) state that they feel "very free" to express their professional opinions to their supervisors, while 2% (3%) do not feel at all free. Sixty-nine percent (47%) feel "very free" to initiate individual actions in their work. Respondents believe they have greater impact on departmental decision making than on the institution:

	Impact on Institutional Decision Making	Impact on Departmental Decision Making
Influential	22%	62%
Contributory	48	32
Insignificant	30	6

When asked "What prevents you from having greater impact within the institution or department?" 30% cited hierarchical, bureaucratic institutional procedures; 24% mentioned sexism and/or male chauvinism; 16% noted lack of confidence, lack of time, lack of interest.

Fifty-five percent (55%) feel some kind of discrimination on the job. Asked to describe the nature of discrimination they felt, 32% cited sex discrimination; 30%, salary and promotion practices; 23% felt discrimination by the type of work assignments given to them; 15% mentioned their status, race, religion, or other factors.

Questioned about the single aspect of their work they liked the best, 53% gave responses related to interpersonal relationships: working with students, working with all kinds of people, associations with staff. An additional 23% identified responses related to the nature of work performed: variety of job responsibilities, diversity of tasks assigned, ability to influence and to give direction to programs. Nineteen percent gave responses related to freedom and challenge of the job.

Asked what one thing they would most like to change about their work, 25% gave interpersonal relationship responses: present administration, infighting, support and recognition from supervisors; 25% responded in terms of the nature of their work: get out of live-in situation, lack of clear job responsibilities, eliminate administration of discipline. Twenty-one percent cited improved working conditions: more clerical and support assistance, less paperwork, better office space and physical facilities, rigid time schedules.

Forty-four percent are "satisfied" with their present jobs; 35% are "very satisfied," 16% are "ambivalent," and 5% are "dissatisfied." Ninety-five percent expect to be working five years from now. Sixty-six percent reported that the Women's Movement has had an impact on their job-related activities.

Professional development. Asked to describe their greatest professional strength, 29% described a specific skill: organizing, administration and management, leadership, decision making, efficiency, political expertise. Twenty-nine percent also cited interpersonal skills: ability to relate to students, relationships with students and staff; public relations and communication; ability to inspire confidence, to persuade others. Twenty-six percent gave a personal characteristic as their greatest professional strength: tolerance, patience, diplomacy, tact, flexibility, integrity, honesty, dedication, drive, energy, tenacity, sense of humor. Sixteen percent felt that their experience or seniority on the job was their primary source of professional strength.

Lack of proper credentials or a specified skill (group skills, finance, budgeting knowledge, political naivete) were described by 40% of the respondents as their greatest professional limitation. Personality characteristics (defensiveness, intolerances, expecting too much from others, impatience, worry, anxiety, fatigue, discouragement) were cited by 39%.

Members' opinions and evaluations. A series of questions was included in the questionnaire to assess members' feelings about N.A.W.D.A.C. One question asked how the respondents learned about the Association originally:

Graduate school faculty	25%
A member	21
A supervisor	14
A colleague	13
Association mailings	12
State Association	7
Other (bibliographies, etc.)	8

Respondents indicated that they joined the Association for professional growth and development, 29%; for professional and personal contacts, 21%; because N.A.W.D.A.C. is a professional women's group, 23%; for the *Journal* or other publications, 7%; because of belief in the goals and purposes, 5%; for placement opportunities, 4%. Seventy percent of the individuals are very satisfied or satisfied with the Association; 27% are ambivalent, 2% are dissatisfied, and 1% did not respond to the question.

Fifty-four percent of those who replied indicated that they intend to maintain their memberships indefinitely; 20%, at least one more year; 19%, 2 to 5 years; 7%, 6 to 10 years. Asked "What would cause you to drop your membership?" 22% gave responses related to costs; 22%, to changes in the organization's purposes. While 63% had never been on an N.A.W.D.A.C. committee, 49% would like to be more involved in the Association activities.

Twenty-nine percent believe that the *Journal* and publications are the most important value of the N.A.W.D.A.C.; 21% mentioned professional growth opportunities; 16%, the fellowship of the members; 15%, that it is a women's organization; 10%, the annual convention.

When questioned about ways in which the Association could be of greater value, 29% gave responses expressing interest in local, state and regional relationships between the national association and the individual member. Twenty-six percent indicated a need to strengthen the nature of the national organization; 13% mentioned specific skill-building needs; 9% sought greater job information and placement assistance; 10% made suggestions related to the *Journal* and publications; 13% hoped for increased participation in Association activities.

Discussion

Based on the 1976 study, to which 55% of the N.A.W.D.A.C. membership responded, the "average" member can be described as:

- between 31-45 years of age
- holds a master's as the highest earned degree (70%)
- is employed in a college or university (76%)
- is likely to be the chief female officer (59%)
- has one of 125 different job titles, 28% of which are *not* student personnel or guidance and counseling related
- reports to a male who has one of 67 different job titles, with "Dean" the most common (31%)
- has been in educational administration from 6 to 10 years
- has been in work other than educational administration about 5 years
- earns between $15,000-$19,999
- does not hold faculty rank (69%)
- holds the rank of Assistant Professor, if rank is accorded
- is likely to have benefits that included financial support to attend professional meetings (71%), health and accident insurance (80%), institutional contributions to retirement programs (65%), and a private office (75%).
- is *not* likely to have the following benefits: sabbaticals (76%), adequate program support financially (57%), maternity leave (54%), and reserved parking (61%).

While the "average" member feels very free to express professional opinions to supervisors and to initiate individual actions in work, she feels her impact on institutional decision making is only contributory. However, she feels influential in affecting departmental decisions. She feels some discrimination, most frequently in terms of sex discrimination, salary and professional advancement, and in the nature of work assignments. She believes her greatest professional strengths are administration, management, ability to organize, and interpersonal relationships. She believes she needs additional training in budgeting, finance and group work. It is interesting to note that prominent among the "average member's" lists of strengths, as well as perceived areas where additional training is necessary, are characteristics

typically associated with stereotypes of the male brethren: administration, management, budget and finance.

The fact that 39% of the respondents chose to list a personality characteristic in response to the feelings of professional limitation surely indicates that the average N.A.W.D.A.C. member is open and probably at a high level of self-awareness. On the whole, she likes her work, particularly her relationships with students and colleagues. She would like to change a bureaucratic administrative structure that stifles significant contributions, and she would like to improve attitudes among some colleagues, most notably male associates.

Comparisons with 1970 survey data. Since the 1970 survey, the Association membership statement has been broadened from a reference to women administrators and counselors to references which include guidance and counseling, student/pupil personnel administration, academic administration, research, teaching, and graduate study at every level of education, elementary through continuing education. In the 1970 survey, the members listed 310 different job titles; 1976, 125. Where comparisons are possible with 1970 data, sharp declines are noted in the use of the title "Dean of Women" and "Dean of Girls." There is a slight drop in use of the title "Dean of Students" (78 vs. 81).

	1970	1976
Dean of Women	N = 239	45
Dean of Girls	29	8
Dean of Students	81	78

Significant among the analysis of job titles is the fact that in 1976, 28 individuals report the title "Director of Women's Programs," a title not in use in 1970.

Using broad category definitions, the members who responded to the survey include:

Collegiate, State, National, and Public School Assistant Executives (Presidents, Vice Presidents, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Superintendents, Principals)	21%
Collegiate and Public School Assistant Executives (Associate and Assistant Deans)	26%
Coordinators/Directors of Specified Program Areas	22%
Counselors and Other Individual Occupational Titles	22%
Academic Faculty	5%
Assistant Directors of Specified Program Areas	4%

Over a quarter of the members responding to the survey hold titles which suggest that the breadth of the N.A.W.D.A.C. membership has expanded significantly beyond student personnel/guidance and counseling. This expansion may include individuals who were formerly in student personnel and guidance work, or it may represent new membership. In either case, the large number gives some indication that the concerns of the members, which must be reflected in convention programs and publications, include

not only residential life and counseling but also executive level management, instructional programming, educational/institutional research, and curriculum and program development.

Marked changes in the status of the female members are noted from additional responses. Far fewer hold tenure and academic rank, but in spite of this, salaries have increased markedly over the six year period. The 1970 study reported a median salary in the $10,000 to $14,999 range. By 1976, the median was in the $15,000-$19,999 range. Nearly a quarter of the members reported salaries in excess of $20,000 in 1976, an extraordinary increase over the 3% in 1970. (Salaries of males in comparable occupational levels, however, are not readily available.)

The number holding full professorships has dropped, perhaps indicating retirements among senior Association members. It is, however, encouraging to note the increase in the numbers of Associate Professors, from 24% in 1970 to 34.5% in 1976.

The 1,259 members report to individuals who have 67 different job titles. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents report to either a President, Vice President or Dean. Sixty-eight percent of these individuals are men. Student personnel administration still is heavily dominated by chief officers who are male. Just as in 1970, 73% of the respondents reported a male chief officer.

Association concerns. Most fruitful for the Association officers and staff are the hundreds of recommendations made by the respondents for the improvement of N.A.W.D.A.C. These have been summarized and made available to the Executive Board, and suggestions for workshops are already evidenced in the 1977 convention program. The challenge to Association officers will be to continue a broad-based appeal: just about as many respondents want the Association to move aggressively on feminist issues as respondents indicated a desire to disassociate from the "Women's Movement." In general, members' comments stressed (1) a need to continue to represent *women's* professional concerns; (2) giving increased visibility to younger members; and (3) the desirability of closer national-state association ties, particularly in state-level meetings and workshops.

Concluding Statement

After the statistics had been compiled and the several hundred comments on the Association had been read, one particular statement from a member stands out as perhaps the perfect description of this Association;

> N.A.W.D.A.C. is small enough to make personal interchange feasible.
> It is professional enough to be valuable.
> It is wide enough in scope to provide perspective.
> It encourages active participation of any and all members, and ...
> It gives each member a sense of worth.

Reference

Berry, M.C. & Fitzgerald, L. E. "The Profile and Status of NAWDC Members," *Journal of NAWDC*, 1971, 34(2), 50-59.

27 A Leap of Faith: Or How to Beat the Middle Management Syndrome

BARBARA BAXTER PILLINGER

Despite the optimistic talk about new and expanding career choices for women, the bitter truth is that, in higher education, very few women are fulfilling central management roles. As of April, 1977, only 156 or 6% of accredited colleges and universities had women presidents, out of a total of 2,620 schools. One hundred five of those 156 presidents were members of a religious order. Out of a total of 380 presidencies which changed occupants between 1975 and 1977, only 46 women were involved (Lester, 1978). The more familiar data on women faculty, sex-based salary inequity, and the closing of women's colleges all belie any optimism generated by our culture's seemingly increased sensitivity to more and better options for women in professions. While no figures are so readily available on vice presidencies, college deanships, and other central management positions, it seems quite clear that the movement of women beyond "middle management" levels — directors, program heads, assistants — does not occur in higher education with any regularity.

This difficulty of movement beyond middle management obviously reflects the continuing social and cultural inhibitors which limit women's advancement. These inhibitors are external factors about which women have little or no short-term control; to some degree, others do control our fate. However, these external inhibitors alone are not the primary reasons for the slowness of women's advancement beyond middle management. There is a whole group of internal factors, most culturally determined, which limit women's movement and about which women do have control. Virginia Lester (1978), one of that handful of women's college presidents, has argued that women unconsciously limit themselves and that the biggest changes necessary for movement to central roles must come from within.

Perhaps one of the greatest of these changes involves expansion of the perception of what roles are possible for women in higher education. In Leona Tyler's (1978) book on individuality, she develops the idea that dimensions of personality are created by the choices made from among the many possibilities, explicit and implicit, which are available. This "psychology of

Dr. Pillinger is assistant vice president for student affairs and associate professor of Educational Administration at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

possibilities" speaks to the notion that a subconscious restriction of oneself is created by a non-recognition of a broad range of possibilities. In effect, what seems necessary is widening of women's possibility structures, of movement beyond current conception of selves and roles to include other ways of thinking and other ways of acting.

Before embarking on that mission, however, it seems important to comment on the nature of that movement. The title of this paper is borrowed from Paul Tillich's theological and philosophical writings about the actualization of freedom as self-transcendence. His idea is that human beings alone have the potential to move from existence to essence, and it is this self-transcendence that is the element of separation and freedom. Tillich (1939, pp. 206-208) identifies four elements of human freedom:

1. The freedom of transcending any given situation and of imagining and realizing something new.

2. Transcending oneself in the direction of complete universality and individuality.

3. Creating with purpose.

4. Freedom from one's own freedom or the freedom to play with one's world and one's self.

There is some risk, of course, involved in this self-transcendence and some unknown areas, and these comprise the "leap" borrowed from Tillich. He describes it this way:

> Actualization of one's potentialities includes, unavoidably, estrangement, estrangement from one's essential being, so that we may find it again in maturity (Tillich, 1960, p. 132).

It seems clear that what Tillich is describing and what women experience in the movement from one role conception to another is a break — a leap to some new formulations of role. It is a leap because it involves, of necessity, estrangement, in Tillich's words, ". . . from tried and true conceptualizations" (1960). Only out of that estrangement comes reconciliation. For Tillich, as for women in this transition, the actualization of freedom quite likely involves separation and reconciliation when full transcendence has been achieved. It is this jump, aided by few intermediate steps, which seems to be involved in the transition beyond the middle management syndrome.

Several characteristics of this transition seem evident, each important when taken singly. Taken together, they truly constitute that leap — a reconceptualization of women's roles in education.

These characteristics can be classified into three broad categories, each containing several aspects of this change. One category clearly is the internal or personal change that central management roles demand. That change also inevitably brings change in the content of one's work — the types of issues and problems with which one deals. The third area of change, and one which is somewhat frightening for many women, is the change in role that central management demands. For most women, experience in such central roles in major institutions is not easily gained. The dimensions of this role change and that of the other changes, in person and in content, are truly new territory.

The remainder of this paper, then, will be an examination of several important aspects of these three categories of transition.

Content Transitions

The changes in work content may be the easiest ones to handle, perhaps because they are more easily predicted, and perhaps because they do not involve the fundamental changes that role and personal reorientation require. Nevertheless, they represent a departure from comfortable territory and provide challenge for that reason.

Among these transitions are two that seem closely related. They are the movement from practice to theory and from action to thought. This new status calls for the analysis of trends, planning for future needs, gathering from the myriad of details some coherent pattern, and translating complex issues to others in simpler ways. The focus is away from doing and toward thinking, from the concrete to the abstract, away from use of prescribed forms and toward the creation of new methodology.

A transition that is often difficult for those who have received satisfaction from gratifying personal interaction in helping relationships with students and others is the movement from person to task orientation. Efficiency and effectiveness place demands on time and energy, which, of necessity, force one's attention to policies and decisions rather than to individual or personal issues.

Time considerations force another content transition as well, this one from predicting to creating. The transition here is in moving away from a focus on outward or external factors that aid in effective functioning to a more internal focus on creating those factors — from reactivity to proactivity.

A transition point that some may challenge is one from women's issues to higher education issues. This does not imply that women's issues do not exist or that they are not important. The point is merely that women's issues are but one of many in higher education and that the concerns of women in central roles, of necessity, must be much broader than this single issue focus.

Perhaps a more global distinction that might summarize several of these content-related transition points is movement from present to future. Planning becomes a much greater part of a central management role: Day-to-day considerations sometimes seem an intrusion rather than a major work function. For those trained to be daily problem solvers, and used to a "here and now" focus, this transition to future or planning modes of operation is occasionally difficult.

Role Transitions

In some ways, transitions related to women's role in higher education and in society are most difficult, because they involve changes not only in women's perception of themselves, but in the way they are perceived by others. The difficulty of maintaining one's own sense of self while also responding to others' expectations and institutional norms is, deservedly, a challenging but frightening proposition.

Perhaps one of the most obvious dimensions of this change in role is the movement from staff to line positions. The world sometimes seems to be comprised of a lot of women in administrative assistant positions! Competence in staff positions comes easily for many women and does not challenge greatly the role definitions women and society have created. Responsibility for directing others, for planning their roles as well as one's own, and for being accountable for broad areas of authority in line positions sometimes is a more difficult conceptualization.

A role change that seems especially exciting is the movement from prescription to empowerment. The idea is to give authority away, to empower and provide others with the opportunity to grow and to expand. The intent of this transition is that of moving beyond satisfaction gained by personal power to satisfaction derived from sharing with capable others with whom one works the tools to accomplish good things on one's own. David McClelland (1975) speaks of a fourth stage of a need for power which has as its central focus the power derived from some sense of greater good, of power derived from the role one can play in the actualization of others' potential. It is this sense of empowering others and in doing so, empowering self, that is of essence in this role transition.

The transition from prescription to empowerment suggests some other changes in role conceptualization. The change from middle management suggests movement from imitation to model, from manager to leader. There is a certain aloneness these roles describe, a qualitative difference between developing patterns of functioning effectively by observing others and the sometimes awesome responsibility of being the one others watch and learn from.

There is a price attached to this transition. Lester points out quite clearly the cost:

> (There are) . . . those who insist that with the coming of women, we will change the price the system exacts from all of us for success. In our foreseeable future, I cannot offer any optimism that is at all possible. Men pay a price. I think most women who want the same rewards will have to pay an even greater price (p. 6).

The manager/leader transition is interesting for another reason. In central management roles, one manages, yes, but that is really only the beginning point, not the end product. The focus, rather, is on leading — on developing and maintaining a vision and on creating conditions such that others can manage effectively within the context of that vision. In essence, it is a movement from units to systems.

The manager/leader change inherently produces two other transition points. We experience movement from responsibility to authority, from efficiency to effectiveness. The quality of difference in these transitions seems reasonably clear — the movement is beyond one set of necessary skills to a new set which includes, but is not restricted to, the old.

A related transition is from specialist to generalist. For years women have taken great pride in knowledge and expertise in an academic field or in a skill area, such as counseling. What this transition calls for, of course, is conversance with many areas and of a focus, not so much on content of issues as on process models.

A role-related transition point that seems crucial, but ever so difficult, is the transition from advocacy to statesmanship. Perhaps in the end, this is more a difference of style than of philosophy. Few women lose their commitment to certain beliefs in the movement from middle management. At the same time, they may not be able to keep the same tone and method of conveying those beliefs. One's role and the way it is performed become much more a symbolic representation of beliefs; the verbalization of those beliefs seems somehow less necessary. The move to statesmanship implies a broader focus and a conciliatory style — one in building bridges, not attacking them. The art is one of compromise and negotiation, not argumentation. The skill is one of establishing priorities and knowing when and how to fight for an ideal or a principle — one doesn't tackle every chance that comes along! Perhaps this statesmanship implies a more pragmatic assessment of what is possible, while retaining the broader long-range vision.

The message here should not be misunderstood — advocacy has its role in the system and fuels the fire used to power the ship. The point is not about whether it should exist, but about where it is appropriate.

Personal Transition

The final area of transition involved in movement to central roles in higher education is a very personal, private one. It involves how women see themselves, what they value, and what they place as priorities for themselves.

In some respects, although these changes appear to be somewhat risky, by contemplating the transition to central management and by recognizing that as a legitimate goal to pursue, the process of personal change involved in this transition may have already begun.

Some aspects of this change are more obvious than others. One that seems reasonably clear is a movement from details and competence to issues and vision. After years of adequately handling and taking pride in tight organization and attention to detail, it is often difficult to move to a realm where the details only bog down the demand for broader thinking. What is needed today in higher education administration are visionaries and planners — people who can free themselves from undue concern over the specific details of a program or idea, people who can envision and create the future of higher education.

A related transition point is movement from organization to creativity. As in the manager/leader transition, the movement from middle management implies that the first quality, organization, is necessary, but not sufficient for effective fulfillment of the work. Creativity becomes a higher order skill.

One aspect of this personal movement that perhaps is not so obvious is that of a focus away from human rights toward human commitment. There is a difference, albeit somewhat subtle, between the verbalization of a philosophy about the basic rights of persons and the commitment to a set of philosophies which are demonstrated daily in one's work.

Perhaps most fundamental, and a transition that many may have already confronted, is that of job to career orientation. Such a change implies a new way of thinking about one's work — not as a means of making a living, but

as a consuming, all-encompassing life's work and life pattern — an expression of self through career. For most women, this undoubtedly involves redefining measures of success. Males define success in terms of occupational achievement. Despite the rhetoric, there are many other priorities for women which compete for the most significant measures of success. Margaret Mead once observed that, within the American culture, "The more successful a man is in his job, the more certain everyone is he will make a desirable husband. The more successful a woman is, the more afraid most people are that she may not be a successful wife" (Lester, p. 6).

Conclusion

It becomes ever more clear that the leap of faith involved in the transitions identified in this paper is real and involves both exciting and profound positive change. It is also true that it involves leaving behind some patterns and styles for which the price of change may be too high.

It is clear that there is a desperate need for more women in central roles in higher education. To that extent, this paper takes an advocacy role. The statesperson role, however, compels insistence that there are choices to be made, and that transitions are not easy, especially for women. In fact, it seems quite probable that some of these transitions do not exist for men, so that the leap takes on even greater magnitude for women. Yet, that gap will never be narrowed for any future generations of women unless some women choose to attempt the leap today, with all of its uncertainty, new role demands, and estrangement from comfortable behaviors. For those who choose to take that leap, the knowledge of the transition may empower one to expand that *realm of possibilities* of which Leona Tyler speaks so eloquently. The leap can be made, and the conciliation found beyond the initial estrangement, which Tillich assures us is there, is a powerful reward for having made the attempt.

References

Hammond, G. B. *Man in estrangement: A comparison of the thought of Paul Tillich and Erich Fromm*. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965.

Lester, V. The biggest changes must come within outselves. Speech delivered at Virginia Commonwealth University. Reprinted in *Interchange* (Commission IV, American College Personnel Association), 1978, **9**(1), 3-6.

McClelland, D. *Power: The inner experience*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Tillich, P. *The courage to be*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

Tillich, P. The conception of man in existential philosophy. *Journal of Religion*, 1939, **19**(3), 206-208.

Tillich, P. *Love, power, and justice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Tillich, P. *Morality and beyond*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Tyler, L. *Individuality: Human possibilities and personal choices in the psychological development of men and women*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

28 The Time to be Properly Vicious

JO ANN FLEY

"You must be properly vicious to make your way abroad," a former headmistress of a British girls' school told me during my first trip to England. Indeed, being "properly vicious" — asserting myself, persevering, insisting upon immediate attention to a matter — brought the necessary results: a cashed check at a bank, the reserved hotel room that had somehow been given away to members of the Japanese wrestling team. I think it time now that American women become properly vicious about their lack of status in American colleges and universities.

This fall's ACE report, *Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-1973*, contained no surprises for recent women graduates from professional programs or for us who served as their academic advisers. The ACE report, covered by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* under the headline, "Affirmative Action Has Little Impact on Faculty Hiring . . .", simply confirmed what we already surely knew, based on first-hand experiences.

I won't mince words. As a professor and adviser to graduate students of Higher Education, I am appalled by the recruitment practices to which women graduates are being subjected in this new climate of affirmative action. The cavalier manner in which some selection committees and employers view women applicants and strive for rationale and means to circumvent equal opportunity employment requirements deserves to be called what it is — discrimination.

The recent experiences of some women students illustrate my point. One student was not offered a teaching position in an old and respected institution of professional preparation because, so went the explanation, she was "over-prepared." How anyone could ever be over-prepared for a teaching position escapes my comprehension. I suspect the employer recognized the candidate was too sophisticated to accept this particular position if offered. Two positions had been open in the department, which announced that it was especially desirous of hiring a woman. One position would allow its holder to qualify for tenure after the standard probation period passed. It was quickly awarded to a man. The second position, which was advertised and for which a woman was ardently sought, was permanently earmarked as a non-tenured position.

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol 37, No. 2 (Winter, 1974), pp. 53-58. Dr. Fley is associate professor of higher education, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

While it is only an impression, I am of the strong opinion that the brighter and more-talented women returning to the job market after earning their degrees have more difficulty getting jobs than do the less-talented. One outstanding Ph.D. graduate was notified of several openings; all paid lower salaries and carried less professional responsibility than the position she held before entering doctoral study. To my disbelief, I discovered that a departmental colleague was recommending her only for these lower-level positions. Asserting that this talented young woman was unrealistic in her job expectations, he insisted, "She must start over at the bottom. She should be applying for jobs as Assistant Registrar!"

Some job-market watchers believe that both men and women stand a better chance, in these days of budget cuts, to be hired or advanced by their own institutions, where potential employers know them and their abilities. My own institution has an unofficial, but frequently-cited policy that it does not hire its own graduates direct from professional study. Exceptions are sometimes made to this policy. Indeed, in the past four years, seven graduates of our program moved directly from completion of professional study into administrative posts. They were all white males! By contrast, women graduates are usually told, "We do not hire our own"; or they are rebuked for "wanting to stay in the womb of their graduate institution."

Another woman, within two chapters of completing her dissertation, was one of three candidates for an administrative position which required specialized skills in finance. These she possessed to the extent that she was offered an instructorship teaching the subject in another department of the institution. Despite assurances that the job would be awarded to the most qualified applicant and that she more than qualified, the administrative post was given to a young man who received his bachelor's degree from this institution last June. The reason given for his hiring was that the entire office had voted on the candidate with whom they thought they could work best. Realizing the woman had grounds for legal action against the University, a high-level "sympathetic" administrator told her she would ruin all chances of getting another job here if she filed a complaint. Moreover, her husband, who also teaches at the University, probably would have difficulty gaining further advancement.

After eight months of searching for a job following completion of her Ph.D., one woman identified several search procedures that she concluded were futile avenues for women applicants. Responding to advertisements in *The Chronicle* or other nation-wide publications seldom rewards the female applicant with more than a form letter acknowledging receipt of inquiry or credentials. The same is true for those announcements that are circulated widely among institutions' affirmative action officers, other administrators, or placement offices. Such formal announcements and fair employment advertisements constitute little more than window dressing — evidence a department can use as one defense, if questioned about possible discrimination in hiring. Inquiries to professional organizations which supposedly maintain pools ... women's names and job openings prove no more effective.

While advising women graduates seeking jobs, I informally followed up on several announcements in *The Chronicle* to which they had responded. What did I find? Some selection committees were so innundated by applica-

tions, one institution simply stopped opening any letter of inquiry after the number reached 400. Still uncertain how to sort out the candidates, the institution decided to jettison all applications, wait for another year, and begin all over again. But it did not notify applicants of this. In another case, an advertisement continued to run in *The Chronicle* several months after the position was filled. In a third instance, I called a male professional acquaintance who was heading the search for a Dean of Students. The first question he posed, even before the candidate's qualifications were discussed, was, "Would she be interested in the position of Associate Dean of Students? We have that open too."

Unfortunately, none of the experiences described here is unique. They and countless similar others comprise an ever-growing portfolio of the typical story of women in academe. The hypocrisies of discrimination are particularly galling today, however, in light of institutions' recent portrayal of themselves as equal opportunity employers. The geometric proportions that ACE's recent findings lend to each academic woman's first-hand experiences sharpen and confirm several observations shared by growing numbers of women in academe. Four observations, in particular, merit comment:

1. Women now employed must be careful not to assume that because they have jobs, their own institutions do not discriminate. Have we ever considered that we may be used as excuses for resisting the hiring of other women? This has happened. This is happening now. Also, compare your salary with those of male colleagues. You may be where you are because you could be hired very cheaply.

2. Not only are women having trouble gaining faculty positions, as the ACE reports, but administrative positions are equally inaccessible. Certainly, diminishing budgets and decreasing numbers of new positions are part of the problem. But insidious forms of prejudice make the problem even more difficult. College administrators may pressure academic departments or housing offices to hire women, yet they seem particularly reluctant to admit women to their own ranks.

3. A woman seeking employment in colleges and universities today needs help from the women who already hold positions therein. Both the formal and informal systems of recruitment that now exist are working to her disadvantage. No matter how creative she is, problems of time, distance and numbers of concurrent applications make it nearly impossible for her to investigate and follow up those instances where she suspects that discriminatory practices ruled her out as a candidate. Finally, on the rare occasion where circumstances provide a job candidate with the opportunity to contest a selection decision, winning a legal contest still assures her an empty victory. What does it profit her to contest and gain a position in order to suffer the daily indignities of an institution that fought her and lost? Tenured women faculty and female administrators can and must help in locating positions for women applicants, in assuring that selection committees do not dismiss qualified female candidates out-of-hand, and in contesting legally discriminatory recruitment and hiring practices.

4. Applying for positions through the formal system is no more effective today than it ever was. What does work? The informal system. Some claim,

however, that the informal system consists only of "Old Boys," and rightfully suggest that we institute an "Old Girl" system to complement (or combat) it. I believe a strong informal communication and placement system did exist at one time among women deans and counselors. But with the dissolution of so many offices of Dean of Women, this system became ineffective. Furthermore, it was a closed system that reflected the autonomy (or isolation) and particular specialties of the Dean of Women's functions.

We cannot leave the responsibility of helping capable women gain entry and advancement in colleges and universities to affirmative action offices, the formal system and the informal system of our male colleagues alone. In the first place, this is not working. In the second place, there are too many legal loopholes by which institutions, their administrators and faculties can and do hedge on equal employment-affirmative action policies. The efforts to date of women already employed in higher education have not been spectacular. We women must assume more initiative and more leadership. No matter what our title or status, I propose that women initiate the following six steps in a campaign to help other women gain entry and advancement in higher education.

1. Re-create a strong national and local informal system. Needed is an "Old Girl" system of women colleagues which stretches into all disciplines, administrative and personnel specialties. If any position on campus opens up, each woman on the faculty or in the administration should be able to suggest one or two names of highly qualified women to fill it. If she does not have names readily available, then she should know whom to contact to get names. This takes time and hard work. It also requires some expense, if a person believes, as I do, that telephone calls are frequently more effective and expeditious than writing letters. Each of us should maintain a portable file containing the names, addresses and telephone numbers of four kinds of women: a) those who we know are searching for positions or who are strong in their fields and might be ready to move when advancement is possible; b) those who hold key positions in institutions or associations throughout the country — presidents, deans, executive secretaries, department heads, faculty in graduate programs; c) women who head "Offices of Women" in professional associations such as ACE or AAC; d) women in our own institutions who should be an integral part of the local informal system. The second group — women who hold key positions in associations and institutions — is crucial to the informal system since these women are close to the pulse of higher education, are frequently aware of openings that have not been widely advertised, and sometimes have credibility in the "Old Boy" system.

One attempt to establish such an informal system on a regional basis is described in the November 5, 1973 *Chronicle of Higher Education*. This represents a good beginning. I urge that we sustain and extend such efforts.

2. Muster up the courage to "watchdog" selection committees from the moment a position is open until the final selection is made. Providing names of qualified women to hiring officers or selection committees in itself is not enough. When we have nominated a woman candidate, or if we know a woman has applied for a position in our institution, we should make regular inquiry into the committee's procedures and progress as well as its criteria

and rationale for selecting the applicant for the job. The candidate herself cannot do this; only we who already hold positions can.

3. Communicate nominations and information gleaned from watch-dogging the selection process to other on-campus female colleagues, sympathetic and supportive male colleagues, the campus Committee on the Status of Women, affirmative action officers, and women's political action groups.

4. Alert those women seeking employment in higher education research or administration to career possibilities in agencies dealing with higher education, but not part of it. Foundations, accrediting agencies, state and regional coordinating boards, professional organizations, private corporations engaged in testing, research and publication need personnel with specialized knowledge of higher education. They seem less hide-bound than most individual colleges and universities. Furthermore, some claim the "real action" is occurring in these agencies, not in the college or university.

5. Advise women students nearing graduation and seeking jobs to look at one-year appointments and non-tenured teaching lines with a cold, astringent eye. Such appointments are frequently offered to women and members of minority groups. They allow an institution to "improve" its statistics quickly without making a long-term commitment to the person; they also preserve budget lines in case a "better qualified" person (invariably male) comes along. Such appointments may be better than no job at all. A person should not delude herself into thinking, however, that "to get her foot in the door" this way, holds any promise that the institution will keep her on. This might have worked once. It does not work that way today. Moreover, legally, the institution is untouchable — "After all, sister, you signed and accepted the terms of the contract!"

6. Advise a candidate, after she has secured a position, to notify all those people who assisted her. This is a matter of simple courtesy, but it has other implications too. She can now take her place in the informal system. In fact, her up-to-date knowledge of how the system works and who is active in it should put her in a uniquely strong position to help other women candidates.

I urge women who are employed in higher education to take advantage of the uneasy lull which exists in the market now, between September and Spring, to build up woman-to-woman contacts with colleagues in their own institutions and throughout the country. My proposals require aggressive action. Courage will be needed. We who were socialized in the era when the very worst thing one could become was "an aggressive woman," will find this role difficult to play. Conflict is not easy. Far easier it is to close our eyes and minds to the injustices around us and say, "It doesn't exist here; after all, they hired me." But how intellectually honest is this? When hard-core, insidious prejudice exists, the "nice guys" do not win. Turning the cheek works only when everyone plays by the same rules of the game. Hundreds of years of black, Jewish, and women's history should have taught us this.

If we hope to change the conditions outlined in the ACE report, if we are even to maintain the advances women as a whole have made in recent years, women in the ranks will have to become more assertive. The time has come to be "properly vicious."

29 "Hurry Up Please It's Time"[1]

HELEN S. GARSON

In a column in *The Washington Post*,[2] Alice Rivlin, an economist, wrote of the difficulties of being a woman professional in a man's world. Hardly a new topic; perhaps to some of us not even newsworthy. Yet, to most of the men I know, and to women who are just entering this "special" world, the problems come as a surprise. We have become so much accustomed to the sounds of "Woman's Liberation," to the magazines, the speeches and speechmakers, and changing laws, that we see the forest of rhetoric and forget the trees that are individual problems.

Those of us who have been struggling for years against standard, typical, even stereotypical attitudes and behavior have long since lost our sense of surprise.[3] Most of the things that happen to one of us happen, or has happened, to all of us at some point in our careers. While Ms. Rivlin, in her article, focuses humorously on manners and responses — "What Do You Say, Dear" — beneath the humor are serious, basic issues.

One of the most serious of these is the struggle of the woman professional to be divested of the adjectival description, in the same way that minority people want to lose their separative identity. We want to be economists, lawyers, deans — not lady economists, women lawyers, female deans.[4] But the social conditioning of most people is such that economist, lawyer, dean implies male, and a female in the profession is an exception. It is that same conditioning that has people ask a new male acquaintance what his work is, and a female the ages of her children. Similarly, whatever work a woman does often is categorized as a hobby or spare time activity which she might pick up or drop at will, like knitting. Recently, at a concert intermission, my husband and I met, some minutes apart, two men we'd not seen for awhile. The first one, making polite conversation, asked me, "Are you still working?" The only difference between that query and the second was in specificity; the second man asked, "Are you still teaching?" Considering the fact that I had been working since long before I knew either of them, I can only think that they regard the work of women as they do a fever: given a short time, it will pass. It would never occur to them to ask my husband whether he was still working or whether he was still practicing law. I suppose, to supply some new life to "What Do You Say, Dear," or to take one

From *The Journal of the NAWDAC*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Summer, 1975), pp. 168-172. Dr. Garson is professor of English, College of Arts and Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.

small step for womankind, in answering, "Yes, I am still working," I might have added, "Are you?"

All working women know from their own experience it is not only the male who regards a woman's work as insignificant. Nonworking women, consciously or unconsciously, tend to denigrate the serious commitment of a woman to her career. I have learned over the years not to complain to non-working friends of fatigue, illness or tension. I learned through the standard responses of my listeners: "Why don't you quit?" or "What do you need it for?" Again, nobody says that to the male if he is fatigued, ill or tense. He gets sympathy, but nobody will suggest that he stop working, even if he earns less money than his wife. In our society, the woman's work that is never done is the work of the home. That is serious business; the rest is frivolity. As a result, this attitude is frequently extended to the woman's professional training, skills and dedication. I have lost count of the numbers of times women have implied that I couldn't have worked as hard as their husbands for a Ph.D., couldn't have as "good" a degree, couldn't be employed in a really superior institution, and couldn't be goal oriented. I have been told by women that graduate schools which are severely pressed by large numbers of applicants — schools of medicine, law, dentistry, psychology — should put women applicants at the bottom of the list because they are not sufficiently career minded. Other women have asked me to vote against the Equal Rights Amendment "for the good of women."[5] Then there is always the old canard, this one voiced by both sexes: women are taking away jobs that men need, especially in this era of recession and over-abundance of Ph.D.'s

A favorite question of both men and women when the discussion concerns female professionalism is: "Would you want to work for a woman?" The response to that one, more often than not, is "No." At a conference of administrators and prospective administrators I attended not long ago, many of us were dismayed to hear a woman professional state sharply, "I wouldn't mind working for a woman if she were competent." The dismay of course resulted from the discovery that even those of us who are reaching out or up have ingrained sexist attitudes. Would it ever occur to us to say or think, "I wouldn't mind working for a man if he were competent"?

In attending conferences and workshops for and about women I have been made aware that each such meeting produces a number of revelations; although at times there is a great sameness to the questions and responses (after all, we are reacting to centuries of behavior patterns), it seems to me necessary that we identify the common bond. We discover, then rediscover that women about to enter new fields are anxious and even fearful of what lies ahead; that no matter what family background one has had, or what discipline she is in, for women the professional difficulties are usually much alike. It is discouraging to learn that there are no quick formulas to apply to the problems, but there is also reinforcement provided by the knowledge that the vicissitudes are not unique to any one of us. They come about primarily, though not exclusively, because we are women. We must accept the fact that we are struggling for ourselves and other women to change old beliefs, attitudes, and prejudices, nor is it as though one great battle will resolve the war for all or even any of us. Rather, one learns painfully that the

days, weeks, months and years bring skirmishes that end in small victories, and bit by bit the individual, and sometimes the group, inches ahead.

While all women professionals have numerous common problems, the woman administrator has some that are unique because she is of a comparatively rare species. As such, she must learn to cope with circumstances the male administrator also faces when he is new to a job. In his situation he does not have sexist barriers, but for the new administrator certain initial handicaps come with the position. Working patterns, efficient or inefficient, have been established previously. Frequently, other people, who have been on the job for some time before the arrival of the new administrator, object to changes — large, small or infinitesimal. There is often a tendency on their part to be suspicious and on occasion even hostile and uncooperative. Sometimes they prefer the old methods and the former administrator. Some are willing to take a "wait and see" approach, whereas others deliberately wage a covert or overt battle. The new administrator has to prove himself or herself in various ways before acceptance is granted, especially by those who work for him. Time on the job solves some of the problems. One gains experience and eventually acceptance from most people. The new administrator brings in a certain style and some expertise which may work for him or her; and the conscientious, thoughtful administrator seeks further guidance in books and journals on education, business and management. Workshops and institutes provide more specific training.

To return to the unique circumstances for the sexist situations in which the woman administrator finds herself, unfortunately there are few "how to" aids. There isn't even one for getting the job in the first place: no "old girls" club exists to parallel that of the "old boys"; few or no role models exist for her to follow; and the woman administrator can be neither one of the boys (that is fear producing), nor one of the girls (that is frivolous). An immediate result of this, unless there are other women administrators in her institution, is that she finds herself very much alone. The men do not include her, for they have not learned to do so. There is a tendency to think of her not as a colleague, but as an accessory similar to one's secretary or one's wife.[6] Defensively, she may avoid any situation which might suggest to the men that she is not equal to the task. After months of loneliness and increasing sense of isolation, she has to opt, however, for human contact or else she will be well on her way to the dehumanization that is characteristic of many administrators.

After the first bloom of the appointment passes, the female administrator discerns rather quickly that the more things change the more they remain the same. In educational institutions faculty are conditioned to work with male administrators. If her institution has had little or no experience with women administrators, few people know where she belongs in the hierarchy, no matter what her title. Unless support is given by the male administrator, she is easily bypassed. Without such support it is awkward and perhaps impossible to fulfill the obligations of the position or to bring about any changes.

Decision making is an area in which sexist attitudes are most apparent. If the woman makes a decision which, without consultation, is later overruled by her male supervisor in the administrative ladder, she is expected to take it

graciously, whereas he regards such an action by his supervisor as an act of treachery. The woman, after a series of episodes in which she is ignored, bypassed and overruled, begins to question whether or not she has been appointed as a "token," an institutional bow in the direction of HEW. Having appointed her, her administrative supervisors may feel that no further steps are necessary. There is neither training, nor teaching, nor sharing. Old fiefdoms rarely change, and never willingly.

One can expend as much energy on changing small things as large. It took me months to get on mailing lists in my institution; week after week I'd make my pitch, explaining that I couldn't understand the material of a meeting, make a judgment or cast a vote unless I had information. Information has been treated like a secret weapon, hidden, protected, known to a few. All too often I have been called upon with little advance notice and absolutely no preparation to take the place of an absent male administrator in making decisions on budgets, buildings, hirings.[7] When he is available, not only do I not make decisions, but I am not generally invited to that type of meeting. It is the double bind: no advance knowledge, no report on conclusions. I learn of recommendations, results, policy changes only if I am willing to follow the same grinding method I took to get on mailing lists. Therefore, an inordinate amount of time can be spent simply in the attempt to keep informed about actions of the administration.

I could enumerate many examples of small skirmishes, some funny, some painful, involving titles, name plates, furniture, office space, telephones, but they all point in the same direction: the time and energy consuming struggles, whose pettiness does not abrogate the fact that these are as exhausting as major problems but more depressing because they may also be humiliating.

Often the secretary to the male administrator is more informed than his female associate. His secretary takes dictation, types his notes, makes his appointments, and keeps the records. She may be as unwilling to change the pattern as he is; although it may be unconscious on her part, she may serve as a barrier to communication between the male and female administrators. But it is the secretary to the woman administrator who may turn out to be the most hostile person she encounters. It is the fortunate woman administrator who can choose her own secretary. Generally she inherits one, chosen either by her predecessor or by her administrative supervisor. If the secretary serves both the male and female administrators, the problems are compounded further. There is no question of priorities; the work and welfare of the male come first. The secretary may see herself as the guardian of the faith, and any woman administrator who tries to change things had best beware.

Reflecting on my experiences of the last few years, I recall a conversation I had with a friend when I was going to participate in a conference about women. She was distressed because I said to her that I was going to tell it "like it is," and she felt that some women would be affected adversely, perhaps discouraged from entering the field. I have no doubt that this might happen. Nevertheless, I believe that it is easier to fight the enemy one sees than the shadows in the dark. Women, unlike men, have few troops to

deploy for battles on many fronts. Clearly, women have many future struggles and we'd like to hurry up on the long road ahead. Having come this far, there really is no turning back. For each of us there is a reminder in lines of Robert Frost that tell us obligations come before rest:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep.
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.[8]

Footnotes

1. Title taken from l. 140 of T.S. Eliot's "The Waste Land." In the original, "it's" has no apostrophe.

2. "In a Man's World," November 20, 1974, p. 26.

3. When I applied for a graduate assistantship to enter graduate school at the beginning of the '60s, I was told by the Chairman of the Department that he did not look with favor on a woman applicant; that he did not want to encourage a married woman to return to school; and that he would not recommend a woman with children. Some years later when I became an assistant professor at another institution, the then Registrar and Director of Admissions was saying exactly the same thing to women applicants. Fortunately, that practice came to an end with his departure. And now there are laws which make such activities illegal.

4. Few of us are "full" deans. At a workshop held by the American Council on Education in Reston, Virginia in the spring of 1974, the point was made that we are the "A's": assistant to; assistant; associate.

5. One of the most intriguing arguments used was that my husband wouldn't have to support me if he divorced me.

6. Recent studies have shown that men tend to judge women by their marital experiences, and their expectations of female behavior are based more on personal situations than on professional ones.

7. Sickness, Christmas, Easter, and summer vacations bring about instant democracy, and the male administrator is more than a little relieved to let his female associate serve in his stead.

8. "Stopping By Woods On A Snowy Evening," l. 13-16.

Author Index

Abramson, J., 61
Adler, N. E., 143
Alexander, S., 122
Almquist, E. M., 90
Alper, T. G., 121
American Assoc. of Univ. Professors, 101
American College Personnel Assoc., 79, 86
Am. Economics Association, 106
André, R., 12
Angrist, S. S., 90
Arkin, H., 72
Arter, M. H., 143
Ashburn, E. A., 61
Astin, H. S., 90, 91, 142
Atherton, G. F., 140

Babes, E. L., 145
Ball, P. G., 130, 131
Bard, J. F., 30
Bardwick, J. M., 38
Barter, A. S., 1, 27, 46, 54, 151
Bartol, K. M., 69
Baumrind, D., 9, 120
Bayer, A. E., 142
Bee, H., 124
Bem, D. J., 5, 8, 9, 118, 121
Bem, S. L., 5, 8, 9, 118, 121
Bennett, S. M., 135, 136
Berg, E., 142
Berger, C. R., 38
Berger, G., 5
Berkowitz, B., 138
Berry, J., 140, 114
Berry, M. C., 79, 164
Bird, C., 138
Block, J. H., 122
Bloom, L. Z., 138
Bohan, J. S., 121
Boverman, D. M., 4, 6, 38, 120, 124
Brent, D. H., 72
Britten, G. E., 122
Brock, L., 2, 4
Brown, D. R., 121
Bull, P. G., 125
Bunker, K. D., 10
Burlin, F. D., 5
Burns, D. M., 29, 143
Burton, A. L., 10
Butterfield, D. A., 9

Cairns, K. V., 1, 3, 4, 5, 6
Calderwood, A., 145
Campbell, R. F., 127
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 12, 63, 68, 145
Carroll, L., 47, 49
Casazza, C. L., 143
Chance, J. E., 10
Chasen, B., 119
Chisholm, C., 51
Cirincione-Coles, K., 3
Cobbey, L. A., 27, 55, 151
Cochran, J., 63, 150
Clark, S. M., 107
Clarkson, F. E., 9, 123
Clement, J. P., 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 59
Crosby, J. W., 28
Coburn, K., 138
Coffin, G. C., 53
Cohen, S. L., 5, 6
Colton, R., 72
Cook, B., 48, 51
Covel, J., 1, 8
Coser, R., 21
Costick, R. M., 141
Council for University Women's Progress at the University of Minnesota, 28
Cunningham, J., Jr., 142
Cummings, N. P., 63, 66, 67

Dale, C., 30
Damico, S. P., 2, 5
Davis, A. E., 76, 143
Deckard, B., 101, 105
Densmore, D., 119, 143
Diamond, H., 4
DiBella, C. M., 10
Dietsch, C., 2
Dimock, D., 104
Dimock, M. E., 104
Drucker, P. F., 135

Eckert, R. E., 70
Eckstrom, R. B., 10
Edwards, M. I., 12
Ekstrom, R. B., 53
Elbe, K. E., 76, 143
Elder, P., 125
Eliot, T. S., 180
Engin, A. W., 119
Epstein, C. F., 6, 7, 76, 119, 121, 143
Epstein-Jayaratne, T., 117
Estler, S. E., 59

Faunce, P., 63, 67, 68
Feather, N. T., 121
Fecher, A. R., 143
Feig, K., 126
Feldman, S. A., 69, 115, 116
Fernberger, S. W., 120
Fillmer, H. T., 118
Fishel, A., 1, 2, 5, 24, 30, 59, 60
Fisher, E., 119
Fitzgerald, L. E., 32, 79, 164
Fixter, D. A., 144
Flammer, D. P., 120
Fley, J. A., 47, 143, 171
Fodor, I. E., 7, 121
Frank, H., 145
Frankel, P. M., 38
Frazier, M., 121
Fredericksen, H., 29
Freeman, G. E., 91
Freeman, J., 115
Frost, R., 180
Furniss, W. T., 140

Gager, N., 48
Gaito, J., 119
Galway, K., 107
Gambrill, E., 138
Garson, H. S., 176
Gemmill, G. R., 6, 10
Giannelli, A. J., 75
Gill, D. G., 46
Gillies, J., 109, 140
Ginzberg, E., 142
Goerss, K. V., 3, 53, 59, 143
Goldberg, P., 9, 143
Gordon, R. S., 125, 130, 131
Gornick, V., 119, 143
Graham, P. A., 90, 140, 144
Grambs, J. D., 4, 6, 7
Grebner, M., 63
Griffiths, D., 29
Grimstad, K., 145
Grobman, H. G., 25, 45
Gross, N., 25, 26, 36, 43, 44
Gruenfeld, E. F., 144

Hall, G., 37
Hammond, G. B., 170
Holland, J. L., 28
Harragan, B. L., 137
Hawley, P., 116, 144
Hays, G. D., 144
Hazard, C., 118
Hedrick, T. E., 6
Heeter, J. S., 64
Heide, W. S., 121
Heilbrun, A. B., 116
Hemphill, J. K., 25, 26, 44
Hennig, M., 137
Henschel, B. J. S., 27
Herriot, R. E., 46

Higginson, M. V., 144
Hilton, C. L., 1, 4, 7
Hines, U. A., 46
Hines, V., 25, 26, 27
Hochschild, A. R., 38, 64, 67, 69
Hoffman, L. W., 122
Hollon, C. J., 6
Holstrom, L. L., 76, 77
Hopkins, J. H., 135
Howard, S., 59
Howe, F., 69, 118, 119, 120
Horner, M. S., 5, 38, 115, 121, 144
Howell, M. C., 50, 117, 144
Hoyle, J., 29
Hulett, S. A., 1, 2
Hull, C., 72

Iblitzin, L. B., 3
Irish, R. K., 144

Jackson, J., 144
Jardin, A., 137
Jarrett, R. F., 124
Jenkins, W. J., 27, 55
Johnson, D., 29
Johnson, J., 153
Jongeward, D., 138

Kahn, H., 144
Kane, J. N., 90
Kane, R., 144
Kantor, R. M., 144
Karabenick, S. A., 121
Kaslow, F. W., 144
Kaufmann, S., 144
Kiesler, S. B., 115, 116
Kobayashi, K. A., 26
Koontz, E. D., 43
Krause, J. L., 27
Krawitz, R. N., 121
Kreps, J. M., 37, 105
Kushner, R., 114, 140

LaBarthe, E. R., 28, 151
Lavine, T. Z., 67
LeCroy, J. R., 67
Lemon, D. K., 27
Leppaluoto, J., 121
Lesser, G. S., 121
Lester, V., 163, 170
Levy, B., 37
Levy, L., 48
Lewis, E. C., 113, 144
Linton, D. L., 27
Loeb, J., 65
Long-Laws, J., 126, 127
Longstreth, C. A., 27, 28
Looft, W. R., 3
Loring, R., 144
Lupini, D., 1, 3
Lynch, E. M., 144
Lyon, C. D., 30, 37

MacConkey, D. I., 130
MacDonald, J. K., 37, 39
McBee, M. L., 141
McClelland, D., 168
McCune, S. D., 5
McEachern, A. W., 43
McEwen, M., 79
McGee, M., 90
McKee, J. P., 9, 120, 144
McLure, G., 36, 121
McManus, P. D., 10
McMillin, M. R., 3, 6

Maccoby, E. E., 21, 120
Mann, D., 25
March, J. G., 63, 91
Marshall, J. M., 121
Mason, W. S., 43
Matheny, P. H. P., 27, 55
Matthews, M., 3, 5
Mausner, B., 121
Mayleas, D., 144
Mead, M., 9, 170
Mednick, M. S., 144
Merigis, H. J., 44
Meskin, J. D., 1
Mickish, D., 30
Milanovich, A., 37
Miles, C. C., 119
Miller, G. P., 138
Miller, J. B., 122, 144
Mi[illegible]bry, P. 135
Mischel, [illegible] N., 8, 9
Mitchell, E., [illegible]18
Montagu, A., 1[illegible] 122
Morgan, S. W., 12[illegible]
Morsink, H., 25, 26, 27, 45
Mosher, J., 118, 120
Mothner, I., 122, 144
Muller, J. K., 70, 75
Mueller, K. H., 118, 120

Naiman, A., 36
National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 77, 86
National Association of Elementary School Principles, 42
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 79, 86
National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 36, 42
National Education Association, 24, 26, 27, 30, 42, 43
National Research Council, 28
National Vocational Guidance Association, 153
Neulig, M. B., 20
Nervell, L. J., 127
Nevill, D., 2
Newman, M., 138
Nie, H., 72

Niebyer, N. A., 4, 5, 90
Nigro, F., 104
Nigro, L., 104
Nolta, M. C., 46
Norman, B., 44, 144
Nystrand, P. M., 145

Oates, M. J., 145
O'Brien, C. R., 153
Olman, R. M., 90, 136, 145
Ortiz, F. I., 8
Otto, H. A., 144
Packard, R., 121
Pallante, J. J., 1, 4
Palley, M. L., 101
Pearlman, J., 138
Peterson, M. T., 30, 54, 145
Pfiffner, V. T., 87, 90, 91
Pillinger, B. B., 165
Pogrebin, L. C., 139
Pottker, J., 1, 2, 5, 24, 30, 32 59, 60
Prather, J., 38
Prince, J. S., 138

Quick, T. L., 144

Ramsey, E., 118
Raphelson, A. C., 121
Reeves, M. E., 76, 145
Rennie, S., 145
Rich, A., 127
Richey, C., 138
Rippey, D. T., 67
Rivlin, A., 176
Rizzs, A. M., 4, 7, 8
Rock, D., 30
Rohaly, K., 135
Rokoff, G., 21
Rose, G. L., 9
Rosenkrantz, P. S., 9, 120, 123
Rossi, A. S., 21, 145
Rothenberg, E., 139

Saario, T. M., 30, 37
Sadker, D., 3
Sadker, M., 3, 121
Sandler, B., 51, 125, 145
Schetlin, E. M., 47, 145
Schmuck, P. A., 59
Scholz, N. T., 138
Schuman, P., 124
Schwartz, L. L., 144
Scott, D., 138
Scriven, D. L., 28, 30, 55
Sears, R. R., 120
Sexton, P., 1
Shainess, N., 9
Shavlick, D., 136, 140, 141
Sheriffs, A. C., 9, 120, 124, 144
Shertzer, B., 79
Silver, P., 100
Simon, J., 107

Simpson, L. A., 145
Sisley, R. C., 127
Smalley, D., 120
Smith, R. A., 7
Soldwedel, B. J., 146, 158
Solomon, L. D., 64
Spence, B. A., 26
Stacey, J., 37
Staines, G., 114, 145
Steinbrenner, K., 72
Stent, A., 69
Stewart, N., 137
Stiles, L. J., 145
Stone, T. H., 11
Sutherland, E., 75
Sutherland, S. L., 145

Tavris, C., 114, 145
Taylor, E., 136, 140, 141
Taylor, H. A., 42, 43, 145
Taylor, S. S., 27, 55, 126
Termna, L. M., 119
Theodore, A., 90
Thompson, H. B., 153
Thurston, A. J., 3, 5, 8, 91
Tibbetts, S., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 118, 122, 142
Tidball, M. D., 145
Tillich, F., 166, 170
Timmons, J. E., 28
Tobias, S., 10, 55, 66
Trask, A., 25, 26, 36
Truex, D., 51
Tyler, L., 165

Van Alatyne, C., 65, 136
Van Meir, E. J., 2, 25, 27, 42, 45, 145
Verheyden-Hilliard, M. D., 19
Vetter, B. M., 145
Vogel, S. R., 9, 123, 124

Walker, W. E., 135
Warwick, E. B., 27, 55
Webb, L. O., 64
West, A. G., 121
Westervelt, E. M., 145
Wheatley, M. J., 142
Wiles, K., 25
Willard, F., 90
Williams, M. G., 137
Withers, J. S., 136
Wolfe, H. B., 76
Wolman, C., 145

Young, C. K., 11
Zakrajsek, B., 11
Zimmerman, J. N., 28, 55